

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XXXI No. 5

MAY 1949

TRANSLATION FROM THE HEBREW

THERE is no doubt whatever that translation from the Hebrew is a most difficult business. One is confronted with a text sometimes (and in certain books frequently and gravely) disordered by scribal errors, conflation, lacunae and doubtful forms; one is reading a language whose grammar, syntax, word-formation and idiom are far removed from ours, not only by several millennia of time, but by differences of outlook, racial, social, literary and religious; one is dealing with a literature whose whole conception of the treatment of legend, history, law, poetry, drama and fiction differs very considerably from ours of today. Yet it is beyond question that the Old Testament holds for us a value both religious and literary, not only because of its perennial message, but also because the whole Christian, New Testament tradition has been built upon its foundations and has developed within its framework. The difficult task, therefore, of presenting the Old Testament to the faithful in their own tongue is one of the greatest importance.

The present article is prompted by the recent appearance of the first volume of the Old Testament in the new American translation which is being made under the auspices of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, which produced the well-known revision of the Rheims-Challoner New Testament in 1941.¹ The book has the same pleasing format and typographical characteristics as that volume. It is the beginning of a large work whose programme includes all the books of the Old and New Testaments, to be newly translated from the original languages. It is not clear whether, when this work reaches the New Testament, the new translation from the Greek will be intended to supersede the edition of 1941, which, professing to be no more

¹ THE HOLY BIBLE/translated from the original languages/with critical use of all the ancient sources/by/members of the Catholic Biblical/Association of America/Sponsored by the Episcopal Committee/of the/Confraternity of Christian Doctrine/The/BOOK OF GENESIS. St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey, 1948. 1 dollar.

than a revision, was of course made on the basis of the Latin, with, however, frequent reference to the Greek, and which was expressly intended to replace Challoner's eighteenth-century text, while retaining in some measure its archaic flavour. This new translation on the other hand is being made into completely modern diction, and the two facts of its being in modern English and translated from the originals will assure it a special place of its own. (The Westminster Version in England is also being translated from the original tongues, but the medium used is "biblical English".) The decision of the American committee to have the translation made from the Hebrew and Greek was apparently undertaken in view of the encouragement of such labours in Pope Pius XII's Encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* of 1943, which of course appeared after the 1941 revision had been published, and after Mgr Knox's work on the New Testament had already been begun. But it must be borne in mind that according to the present legislation of the Biblical Commission (30 April, 1934, and 22 August, 1943) it is a version from the Latin, such as Rheims and Douay and their revisions, or Mgr Knox's translation, that must be used for reading to the people in church, while a translation from the original may indeed have an official status, such as the Westminster in England or the translation under discussion in America, and may be used by the faithful for study and reading, or especially by preachers for the elucidation of a version made from the Latin, but is not available for quasi-liturgical reading from the pulpit. It will be interesting to see whether this new American version will achieve a liturgical status, and if so whether the decree of 1943 will be modified. It is worth reminding ourselves in passing that the French have just begun the publication of a new Catholic translation of both Old and New Testaments from the originals—so far St Mark, St Luke, Maccabees and the three last Minor Prophets have appeared.

Catholic editions of the Old Testament in English have been very few. The first was the Douay text, of which the first volume appeared in 1609, with a second edition in 1635. The translation was made from the Latin. Dr Challoner produced his first revision of the whole Bible in 1750, and his second in 1763-64, and until recent times all Catholic texts of the Old Testament

in English have been dependent on these. With the exception of the original Douay, the Old Testament was very rarely issued separately from the New. The three recent versions, independent of Douay, are as yet incomplete: (1) The Westminster began to come out in parts in 1934: four Minor Prophets, Ruth, the Psalms, and this January (1949) Daniel, have so far appeared; (2) the new American version has begun with Genesis; and (3) the first volume of Mgr Knox's Old Testament, translated from the Latin, is expected early this year. It will thus be seen that the appearance of the present volume is something of a landmark in the history of Catholic Bibles in English.

He who translates from the Hebrew is immediately faced with certain particular problems which he does not share with either the translator of the Greek New Testament or the translator of the Latin Bible. The problems can be gathered under two main heads: first to discover the true meaning of the Hebrew, and second to choose the idiom in a modern language which will closest correspond to the remote idiom of a language so utterly different from his own. Let it be said at once that these two classes of problems exist in some measure for the translator from any language (the meanings, for instance, of French words do not correspond throughout to English words), but among European languages there is frequently at least etymological kinship, and usually some degree of grammatical and syntactical kinship, all of which are normally absent between Hebrew and English. The vehicle of "biblical English", as used by the translators of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is in fact an importation into English of something of Hebrew syntactical form, which has produced a recognized English literary style. This fact explains its adoption in modern times by the Westminster Version. The new American version on the other hand sets out to find a more modern medium which will nevertheless convey accurately the Hebrew thought-forms.

In the first place, however, the translator from the Hebrew has got to decide for himself the meaning in Hebrew of an obscure passage, of a rare word, or of a place where the text appears to be faulty. He must on the one hand guard against

being too ready to assume that a text he cannot understand is unsound, and to permit himself a conjectural emendation, or on the other hand to jump to conclusions about the significance of a word by superficial etymology, or to attempt to extract from a passage a meaning which a good knowledge of Hebrew must perforce reject as a rendering of those words.

The older versions have tended to err in the latter direction, manfully translating word for word according to the known or supposed meaning of the Hebrew roots, when in fact the text as it stands is simply not Hebrew. St Jerome sometimes did this (taking the line of least resistance, surely with a smile), producing a string of Latin words corresponding in each case to a probable meaning of the Hebrew and dutifully standing in the order of the Hebrew words, but in point of fact yielding little or no sense.¹ An obvious case which comes to mind is the awkward passage in Micheas i, 10-15, which includes the following sentences: "Et transite vobis, habitatio pulchra, confusa ignominia; non est egressa quae habitat in exitu; planctum domus vicina accipiet ex vobis, quae stetit sibimet." In the same tradition is the Revised Version, which has a tendency to skate over a danger-spot, smoothing out the translation by means of particles and prepositions in English, so that the casual reader is blissfully unaware of the riskiness of the process. An example may be seen in the same passage in Micah, where recourse is also had to another favourite device which may be summed up in the undergraduate adage "When in doubt, make it a proper name." Thus in the Revised Version we sometimes find a number of hitherto unheard-of proper names, which St Jerome on the other hand usually translated according to their Hebrew roots. Let it be observed here in passing that the new Latin Psalter tends to favour proper names rather than the translations in the Vulgate Psalter (e.g. in Psalm xciv, "Massa" and "Meriba" have replaced the "exacerbatio" and "tentatio" of the old text).

The exegesis of the last hundred years has on the other hand tended to err at the other end of the scale. Rather than attempt

¹ Mgr Knox, in an article, to be quoted again later, in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, October 1948, "Farewell to Machabees", p. 220, speaks of "the rare occasions when there is no sense to be extracted from the Vulgate at all".

to translate the text as it stands at all costs, the rationalist critics, full of the new Hebrew learning, were only too ready to manhandle the text of a passage which did not square with Hebrew usage as they knew it from other parts of the Old Testament. Thus a host of conjectural emendations sprang up. Many of these were well-founded on readings of the Septuagint and other early versions, many were highly ingenious and plausible but remained pure hypotheses, while some were so hypothetical that they had to remain in the realm of fantasy. Of these fruits of rationalist criticism very many have stood the test of time and have come to be, quite rightly, accepted as current coin among all exegetes, albeit remaining conjectures. Indeed conjectural restoration of the text becomes a necessity when the Hebrew as it stands cannot, in the light of all available research into Hebrew usage of the period in question, be reasonably regarded as real Hebrew; and Catholic scholars of the present day are fully alive to this situation. The Holy Father himself in *Divino Afflante Spiritu* places the work of the restoration of the text and the elimination of textual corruptions among the first tasks of the Catholic exegete, adding that this technique "has achieved such stability and sureness of principles that it has become an excellent instrument for producing a purer and more accurate edition of the word of God; and any abuse of the art can now easily be detected".¹ The new official Latin Psalter (1944-45) has indeed given a lead in this matter by making considerable use of such conjectures (a random instance on its second page is in Psalm ii, 12, where four letters are held to have dropped off from the end of a line, and their insertion provides a reasonable reading for an otherwise apparently impossible passage). Fr Lattey's Westminster Psalms in that passage represent the same emendation; but let it be said at once that the Westminster is meant for study and reading with its notes, while the 1945 Psalter is designed for recitation apart from its critical notes. P. Condamin in his big commentaries on Isaias and Jeremias sometimes reduces his translation to a line of dots (e.g. Jeremias xv, 12), when he feels that the text as it stands is patient neither of translation nor of emendation apart from the purest hypothesis. But again these translations are meant as a

¹ Paragr. 23 in C.T.S. edition.

guide for study and not for liturgical or quasi-liturgical reading.

To ascertain the meaning of the Hebrew text before him is therefore the first and main problem of the translator from the Hebrew. The translator of the Latin Bible, although he is admittedly dealing with Hebrew thought-forms in Latin dress, has not only the kinship of the Latin tongue with his own to help him, but also the fact that the Vulgate text has quite often already imposed a definite meaning upon the Hebrew. Examples that come to mind readily are the incomplete statement in the Hebrew of Genesis iv, 8, "And Cain said to Abel his brother . . ." (where the Vulgate has supplied what he said), or the famous "cabins" in Noe's Ark in Genesis vi, 14 (where the Hebrew word is obscure), or the strange list of animals in Sophonias ii, 14 (where the Vulgate at any rate names animals we have heard of before).¹

The second group of problems that confronts the translator from the Hebrew is concerned with the choice of idiom of his own tongue that he is going to use. Mgr Knox² says that "your examination of conscience, when you are doing any translating work, is obviously grouped under three heads: Is it accurate? Is it intelligible? Is it readable?" The problem of accuracy does not necessarily depend upon the literalness of the translation—in fact it may happen, as the same writer has explained, that the literal translation, owing to the changed value of words in the course of time, may be inaccurate, and that the periphrasis may convey the sense of the original more surely.³ We have already observed that "biblical English" as a literary form is for the most part directly derived from a literal rendering of Hebrew prose, preserving, as far as possible, the syntax of the Hebrew, and frequently using words, as it were borrowed from the vocabulary of everyday English, and assigning to them a specialized "biblical" meaning which is to correspond with the Hebrew idea. An obvious example is the phrase "loving-kindness" in the Authorized Version which became a token for the Hebrew idea of *hesed*. A similar case is that of God's "judgements" all through the Old Testament to express the moral goodness that is the manifesta-

¹ Cf. Mgr Knox, loc. cit. p. 220.

² Loc. cit. p. 218.

³ Cf. Mgr Knox in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, July 1945, "Some Reasons Why", pp. 291-3, and an article by the present writer in the same journal for October 1947, "Some Thoughts on Translations of the Bible", pp. 217 seq.

tion of his will. These notions, and scores of others, became accepted symbols for certain Hebrew ideas (as did the corresponding symbols in the Latin Vulgate), and have become part and parcel of our own language and accepted usages in Christian thought.

This brings us to the further question of whether at the present day in modern paganized society these symbols have remained intelligible? It is largely a question of the audience. To the student or the scholar, using the Westminster Version, these token-words are full of meaning. Even to the ordinary Christian reader of an earlier generation they had an accepted significance, for they were part of the normal English heritage—after all, did not the kindly authorities at Euston Station at one time provide Bibles in the waiting-rooms? But as regards the casual reader of today, these things are now of the past: for the mass of men who cannot read (except of course hoardings and newspapers), the token-words are unintelligible.

From this it is not a far cry to Mgr Knox's third "hurdle", readability. The simple Hebrew syntax with its reiterated "and", the dialogue with its recurrent "and he said", the constant introduction by the phrase *wayehi* (for which the token was "and it came to pass"), the relatively few Hebrew verbs which are put to so many uses, all these things which were brought into our language to form "biblical English" are an accepted medium to "the discreet reader that deeply weigheth and considereth the importance of sacred words and speeches" (as the Rheims preface of 1582 said), but they are hardly readable or inviting to the modern man who has not been brought up on them. There is so much in the manner of the Old Testament, its presentation of history, of law, of moral and spiritual advice, of religious sentiment, that is foreign not only to our literary idea of today but indeed to western literature as a whole, that the plea for the accommodation of its thought-forms in a modern vehicle which is the product of our own lands and our own times is not to be neglected.

In this connexion we may be permitted to ask ourselves whether when we paint the picture of Abraham and Isaac we are attempting to represent them as we would an English (or American) boy and his father of *circa* A.D. 1948, or a Hebrew

boy and his father of *circa* 1948 B.C.? The answer to this depends on where we place the emphasis in our translation of Old Testament narrative: on the perennial father and son, the undying faith of Abraham, the timeless drama of the event, the permanent message of the Old Testament—in which case modern dress will not spoil but rather enhance the power of the scene; or whether we underline the historical nature of the account, seeing in the Old Testament God's care of his people in particular places and times, his gradual revelation of himself through the ages, and his promises culminating in the Coming of the Redeemer at a particular point in the world's history—in which case the anachronism would jar, and the historical perspective would be preserved by the preservation of something of the remote and archaic diction of the period.

.

With all these problems in view, we can turn to an examination of the new American Genesis with especial interest. Under the auspices of an editorial board of thirteen, four of whom were on the board that produced the revision of the New Testament in 1941, the translation was made by one of their number, Fr Edward A. Mangan, C.S.S.R.

The translation was made from the ordinary Massoretic text of the Hebrew, and at the back there is a table which purports to show the passages where the Massoretic text has been abandoned in favour of a reading based on one of the ancient versions or on a conjectural emendation, or where the meaning assigned to the Hebrew text as it stands is arrived at either purely with the aid of the versions or purely by conjecture (in the absence of evidence in the Hebrew word itself). There is always an indication of the source of the correction, or of the fact that the rendering is conjectural. The emendation of the text proposed in the note on xx, 4, is in fact not used in the translation of that passage, and the rendering of xvi, 13, "Have I really seen *God* and *remained alive* after my vision" involves considerable conjectural emendation without any note to this effect being provided—be it, however, at once observed that this is a perfectly warrantable emendation. This may also be said of most of the emendations proposed: the greater number (66 of

them) are based on the LXX or other ancient version. A further eighteen emendations are in the hypothetical order. Although one might take leave to hesitate about some of them, such as in vi, 14 (of the ark), "Make it *tight with fibre*" (where, however, "make cabins" is very uncertain), or the somewhat gratuitous alteration in ix, 7, "abound on the earth and *subdue* it" (proposed, it would seem, to bring it in line with i, 28), or the rendering in xlv, 28, "so that he would *meet him* in Gesen" on the rather tenuous support of the supposition that this is what the LXX understood from *lehērāōth* in place of *lehōrōth* (presumably meaning "to direct"), the greater part of the emendations used are generally accepted. There are a handful of places (15) where the meaning of the text as it stands is reasonably conjectured from the context, as for instance the "mist" in ii, 6, which was the suggestion also of the Revised Version. It may therefore be said in general that the translator has tackled the first main problem, that of ascertaining the true text, in a satisfactory way, although the acceptance or rejection of this or that critical emendation, or this or that reading of the LXX, of necessity must in many cases remain a matter of the exegete's own judgement.

The medium of translation which has been chosen is that of purely modern English (or rather, American), and here a certain freedom has been somewhat inconsistently applied. The Hebrew archaisms of "biblical English" have disappeared in a deliberate striving for modern expression. "Thou" has been entirely eliminated, even when the Divinity is addressed. Many an initial "and" has been omitted, or replaced by "then" or something similar. The perpetual "he said" is varied with "he replied" or other such phrases. The frequent modern device of inserting "he said" after the beginning of a speech, contrary to the Hebrew order which never does this, is rarely resorted to: e.g. xl, 9, which will serve as an example of general style as well:

A plain tr. from the Hebrew

And the chief butler told his dream to Joseph, and he said to him: "It was in my dream, and behold a vine before me, and on the vine three branches . . ."

New version

So the chief butler told Joseph his dream. "In my dream," he said, "there was a vine in front of me. Three branches were on the vine . . ."

Sometimes the dialogue is particularly good and the simplifying of phrases such as "she hastened and lowered" to "she quickly lowered" lightens the narrative but omits nothing. An example from the message of Abraham's servant to Laban, with reported dialogue—the use of inverted commas throughout is helpful—in xxiv, 45–7, will show this:

A plain tr. from the Hebrew

I had not yet finished speaking within myself, and behold Rebecca coming out, and her jar upon her shoulder, and she went down to the well and drew. And I said to her: "Give me (I pray thee) to drink." And she hastened and took down her jar from upon her, and she said: "Drink, and to thy camels I will also give to drink." And I drank, and she also gave to drink to the camels. And I asked her and I said: "Whose daughter art thou?" And she said: "The daughter of Bathuel, son of Nahor, whom Melcha bore to him."

New version

"I had not yet finished planning this when Rebecca came with her jar on her shoulder, went down to the spring, and drew water. I said to her, 'Give me a drink, please.' She quickly lowered her jar and said, 'Drink, and I will also water your camels.' So I drank and she also watered the camels. Then I asked her, 'Whose daughter are you?' and she replied, 'I am the daughter of Bathuel, son of Nahor, whom Melcha bore him.'"

One asks oneself whether the frequent *-na* after an imperative (the token for which is usually either "I pray thee" or "now") is satisfactorily rendered "please", or whether the more elaborate "If now I have found grace in thy eyes" (e.g. xxx, 27, and *passim*) is adequately represented by "If you please", though these are obviously the modern equivalents. The phrase "These are the generations of . . ." is variously rendered: ii, 4 (of heaven and earth), "This is the story", x, 1 (of Noe, with list following), "These are the descendants", xxv, 19 (of Abraham and his family), "This is the family history" and similarly in xxxvii, 2 (of Joseph), though in the last two cases the phrase hardly introduces a family history. There is an inconsistency in the modernization of the phrase formerly rendered "to prosper the journey": in xxiv, 42 and 56, the old phrase is retained, but just before this in xxiv, 21, we find what the English reader finds difficult to swallow: "... whether or not the LORD had made his trip successful" and again in xxiv, 40. The odd thing is that in

v. 40 it is Abraham that is speaking of the "trip", while in vv. 42 and 56 it is the servant, using the old phrase. Again one takes leave to doubt whether in xli, 45, "Joseph went out upon the land" is improved by "made a tour of . . ." But it may be that these things cause no astonishment to the American reader. Perhaps also the phrases "stay outdoors" (xxiv, 31) and "fled outdoors" (xxxix, 12) are usual Americanisms.

Sometimes the modernization causes nuances to be badly missed. A Hebrew son was, one feels, more respectful towards his aged father than is an American boy to his old dad, and anyway there is a notably different tone in the manner of Jacob and Esau towards their father: Jacob (xxvii), "Arise now, sit and eat of my game"; and Esau (xxvii, 31), "Let my father arise, and let him eat of his son's game." The atmosphere is completely lost in the new version: Jacob, "Sit up, please! Eat again of my game"; and Esau, "Sit up, father, and eat of your son's game." The translator evidently felt that the appellations "My father—my son" are not quite American, so that he usually writes "Father—son", though in xxvii, 38, he is inconsistent, when "Father" and "My father" occur in the same speech when the Hebrew both times has possessives.

There is drama in the remote diction of the Hebrew that can be lost in the modern version. For instance xxii, 6-8:

A plain tr. from the Hebrew

And Abraham took the wood of the sacrifice, and he put it upon Isaac his son, and he took in his hand the fire and the knife. And they went on, the two of them, together. And Isaac said to Abraham his father, and he said: "My father." And he said, "Behold me, my son." And he said, "Behold the fire and the wood, and where is the sheep for the sacrifice?" And Abraham said, "God will see to the sheep for the sacrifice, my son." And they went on, the two of them, together.

New version

Abraham took the wood for the holocaust and put it upon his son Isaac while he himself carried the fire and the knife. As they walked together, Isaac said to his father Abraham, "Father." He answered, "Yes, son!" He said, "You have the fire and the wood, but where is the sheep for the holocaust?" Abraham replied, "God himself will provide the sheep for the holocaust, my son." And they went on together.

The grim repetition of the phrase expressing that silent walk is lost through an anxiety to provide varied fare in the matter of

verbs and conjunctions. Similarly in the account of creation, the reiterated "And it was so" (retaining the Hebrew order), usually appears as "And so it was", but the "and" is dropped in i, 15, spoiling the effect of the refrain. And in the next verse the mighty (as it were) afterthought "And the stars" ceases to be mighty in the bald statement "And he made the stars".

Examples could be continued for pages to show how the modern diction indeed makes the narrative smooth and readable, although the English reader finds that the American modernity obtrudes itself at intervals in a disconcerting way, with consequent loss (to English ears) of dignity to the sacred text.

Lastly, an observation should be made on the proper names. Generally the usual Vulgate forms are retained, though occasionally with unfamiliar spellings, and one is at a loss to understand the principle that has been followed. Examples are Thubalcain (iv, 12), Arphachsad (x, 24), Mamre (xiv, 13), Amorrite (xv, 16), Loommim (xxv, 3), Jabooc (but probably a misprint, xxxii, 23), Succhoth (xxxiii, 17), Gesen (xlv, 10). Let it be noted at once that these are not simply borrowed from the Revised Version as are many of the names in the Westminster Version. Joseph's Egyptian name (xli, 45) is given as Saphaneth-phanee, which is a peculiar transliteration. (The Vulgate and Douay translated the name, the RV has Zaphenath-paneah, a fairly exact transliteration.) The Tetragrammaton is rendered "the LORD" (in "small caps" as in the RV), though the place-name in xxii, 14, is given as "Yahweh-yireh".

There is no doubt that the inauguration of this new Catholic version of the Old Testament from the Hebrew into modern speech is an event of no small importance in the history of English Catholic Bibles, and the Holy Father himself has said that this volume of Genesis is "a source of deep satisfaction and consolation" to himself, since it is spreading the Word of God not only on a "strictly scientific basis, but also in a form adapted to the capacity of the ordinary faithful".¹

It would be a most desirable thing if the faithful on both sides of the Atlantic were able to avail themselves of the same versions of the Scriptures, and the 1941 American Revision of

¹ In a letter from the Secretariate of State to the Catholic Biblical Association of America, as reported in *The Alamo Register* (Denver, Colorado), 17 December, 1948.

the Rheims-Challoner New Testament did happily receive some diffusion in this country through the *Daily Readings* and *Sunday Missal* of Fr Stedman, that holy and apostolic priest who did so much and so admirably for the piety of English-speaking Catholics (†23 March, 1946). But that version did not set out to produce an entirely modern translation, though it discarded archaic verb-forms ("goeth", etc.) and a number of notably obsolete phrases. The new version of Genesis, however, by its very modernity seems to underline the differences that have grown up between the everyday speech of the Americans and ourselves, and although one can sometimes read for several pages without an American voice ringing in one's ears, yet there are many passages that can hardly be read out convincingly without an American intonation. If this version should ever become current in our land it would require adjustments to be made by an English committee, in much the same way as the Protestants of America produced in 1901 a variant of the (Anglican) Revised Version, which became known as the American Standard Version, and which is in turn being revised to produce the Revised Standard Version (the New Testament of which appeared in 1946). It would be interesting to know how the American reading public has taken to the new Genesis and whether the turns of phrase that seem alien to us receive ready acceptance among them, or whether there are those among them who also feel that the patches of popular diction cause an inequality of style that roughens the narrative and reduces the native grace of the Hebrew.

But to translate Hebrew into natural and effective modern English is a most difficult business, and the Catholic Biblical Association of America are to be congratulated on having undertaken this arduous and important task.

SEBASTIAN BULLOUGH, O.P.

PARENTS AND SEX INSTRUCTION¹

WHAT exactly is meant by this problem of "sex instruction" or "sex education"? It is a problem that faces grown-ups, because of a difficulty that is facing our children. This is their difficulty, that children growing up in modern conditions are finding it hard to acquire a sensible, correct and Christian attitude towards sex. And by sex we mean everything connected with the fact that God made us male and female. "And God created man to his own image; to the image of God He created him; male and female he created them."² Because of this difficulty, children need our help. What is the best way to give it to them? That is the problem of sex instruction.

If we think over their difficulty, we soon realize that it can be divided up into:

(1) An intellectual difficulty, which is merely the difficulty of gaining the information about sex which a growing child needs, and (2) A moral or spiritual difficulty, consisting in the difficulty of fitting in these facts about sex with the rest of our Catholic teaching and with God's plan, so that the child may keep a balanced and reverent attitude of mind towards sex. This is the greater and more important of the two difficulties.

How did these difficulties arise?

The intellectual difficulty is chiefly due to the springing up of our large towns after the Industrial Revolution. When children lived in the country they were familiar with nature, and learned of birth and sex without the need of much help from grown-ups. The knowledge they needed came to them very gradually, almost unconsciously, in a completely natural manner. But today, when four-fifths of the population are living in the towns, how are our children to learn of these things?

But it is particularly the moral and spiritual difficulty which has increased so much, even since our own childhood. Fifty

¹ This is the substance of an address made to the Catholic Parents' and Electors' Association at Hexham. It is hoped that it may soon be made available to parents generally. But it has been thought wise to submit the text to the criticism of the Clergy in the first instance. Any suggestions or criticisms will therefore be welcomed.

² Gen. i, 27.

years ago England was outwardly Christian. Lip-service at least was paid to God, so that a child's home life was supported by his experience outside the home. The result was that when he learned the facts of reproduction the knowledge dropped into place in his mind, without effort and without disturbance.

But today England is practically pagan. A disastrous fall in moral standards has occurred comparatively recently, especially since the First World War. The result is that no matter how well you shelter your children in your home, your good influence is being opposed and weakened by the worldliness and paganism outside your home. For example, at the "pictures" they are being fed on and unconsciously tainted by Hollywood principles of philosophy. The wireless, newspapers, magazines, much of what they see on the streets—all this is tending to weaken their faith in the real purpose of life and in God's plan for our happiness. It is making it more difficult for them to acquire and keep a Christian view of life and of sex.

If you agree that there is a serious intellectual and spiritual difficulty facing our children, then we are ready to face our problem: What can we do about it? How can we help them? We will look at three possible ways of treating the problem:

(1) We can ignore the problem, and let things go on as they have been. That, I think, would be wrong.

(2) We can give, or see that our children are given, full and detailed biological instruction in these matters. That also would be wrong.

(3) We can attempt to solve both halves of the problem, intellectual and spiritual, on principles laid down by Popes Pius XI and XII and by the Bishops.

Suppose we take each of these in turn.

(1) We can ignore the problem. We can leave the whole thing alone, either by persuading ourselves that this is the best thing to do, or by persuading ourselves that the responsibility belongs to someone else—the priest, for example, or the school-teacher. An examination of some arguments often advanced by parents will soon show the inadequacy, and indeed the injustice, of such an attitude.

(a) "*We've managed all right up to now.*" Up to now, yes; but, as has been pointed out, England has become so rapidly pagan

that the problem is far more urgent today than when you were children.

(b) *"They'll get to know somehow or other; there's no need for me to say anything."* In reply to this; firstly, may I ask if you are really and honestly satisfied with the way in which you yourself found out the facts of life? Do you want your child to find them out in the same way? Secondly, here are the results of some research carried out in America. Two thousand high-school boys taught by priests, brothers, and nuns were questioned as to where they got their first knowledge of sex matters, and what effect this knowledge had on them.¹ It was found that if the knowledge came from a good source (from parents, priests, teachers, nuns), the knowledge had a good effect on the boys in sixteen cases out of seventeen (i.e. in just over ninety-four per cent of cases). But when the knowledge came from other sources, such as companions, magazines, the pictures, etc., in other words when they were left to find out for themselves, the effect was good in only one case out of four. Now, will you leave your child to find out for himself, or are you going to help him?

(c) *"He'll ask the priest in confession when he wants to know anything, it's not my business."* If he does ask, he will be the exception. The normal child, I think, seldom asks questions in confession, even on ordinary matters. On this particular subject, even supposing he did want to ask, a child would have great trouble in putting his difficulty into words, and this would usually scare him off. Most certainly the priest should be asked about any spiritual difficulties; but equally certainly the act of reproduction should not and must not be explained by the priest in the confessional.²

(d) *"There's no need for sex instruction at all. We should be more concerned about preserving their innocence as long as possible, than about teaching them such things."* Of course we must preserve their innocence. That is our whole aim. But ignorance is not innocence. Purity is innocence, and the right knowledge at the right time, far from spoiling purity and innocence, will preserve and increase them.

¹ *The American Adolescent and Religion*. By Urban Fluge. Lumen Vitae. 1947. No. 3.

² Instruction of the Holy Office, 16 May, 1943. "Itidem ne audeat confessarius, seu sponte seu rogatus, de natura vel modo actus quo vita transmittitur poenitentes docere, atque ad id nullo unquam pretextu adducatur."

(e) "*They'll do it at school ; I needn't bother.*" In reply, I quote the Bishops : "Parents should remember that the obligation to see to the religious and moral education of their children rests primarily on themselves, and that there are certain aspects of this education which cannot satisfactorily be delegated to others."¹

From all this we can conclude :

1. That some instruction is certainly necessary. The very fact that so many parents try to evade the responsibility by arguments such as the above shows that the need exists. "If a youth is to be trained in the virtue of purity," said the Scottish Bishops, "some minimum knowledge of the facts of life is necessary."² And Fr Vermeersch says in his book on Chastity : "We can unhesitatingly affirm that there is occasion for sex instruction, and the only serious question that remains is the best manner and time for giving it."³

2. That this duty rests on the shoulders of the parents of the child. Pope Pius XI says : "And there can be no doubt that, by natural and divine law, the right and duty of educating offspring belong primarily to those who, having begun the work of nature by begetting children, are absolutely forbidden to leave unfinished the work they have begun, and so expose it to inevitable ruin."⁴ And the English Bishops say in their Joint Pastoral : "As regards the parental instruction of children in the matters concerned, we are convinced that herein lies the chief cause and the remedy which is being sought. There is today a lamentable decline in family education, due largely to an ever-increasing tendency on the part of the parents deliberately to shirk their obvious duty." And the Scottish Bishops : "The bond established by nature between parent and child is so close that such an intimate and sacred subject as discussion of sex is primarily a matter for parent and child."⁵

There is the first possible reaction to the problem. To ignore it is not an adequate answer. Something must be done, and you parents are the proper persons to do it.

The second possible way of treating the problem consists in

¹ Joint Pastoral of the English Bishops, April 1944.

² *Memorandum on Sex Education*. Published with the approval of the Bishops of Scotland.

³ A. Vermeersch, S.J. *De Castitate*. Rome. 1919. §191.

⁴ Pius XI. On Christian Marriage.

⁵ *Op. cit.*

seeing that our children are given full biological instruction in sex. This method is very much in favour at the present time among non-Catholics and with the education authorities. As you know, there are a great number of books being published just now advocating and giving this type of sex instruction. As an example we may mention the Government-sponsored pamphlet entitled "Sex Instruction".¹ We choose this because it is official, because it clearly states the modern theory and policy of sex instruction, and because this pamphlet occasioned the Joint Pastoral of the English bishops. It recommends that every child should be given, in school, a full knowledge of the facts of sex.

"But the remedy is to be found," the Bishops say, "not so much in the imparting in public of fuller and more systematic knowledge of sex from the physiological or biological standpoint as by the removal of external temptations and by the general and determined inculcation of the practice of Christian virtue, and our dependence on Divine grace."

This agrees exactly with the general criticism of this type of sex education made in 1930 by Pope Pius XI: "Much more pernicious are the naturalistic doctrines and theories which obtrude themselves into a department of human education that bristles with difficulties; that which concerns moral integrity and chastity. Adopting a policy which is as foolish as it is fraught with danger, there are many who advocate and promote a method called by the unpleasant name of 'sex education'. They are under the false impression that it is possible by merely natural arts, and without any of the safeguards of religion and piety, to forearm adolescents against unchastity and sensuality. They therefore initiate and instruct them all, without distinction of sex and even in public, concerning these delicate matters; worse still, they expose them to premature occasions of sin in order—so they argue—to accustom their minds to such things and so harden them against the dangers of puberty.

"Their serious mistake lies in a failure to acknowledge the inherent frailty of human nature and the existence of that law within our members which, in the words of St Paul, fights against the law of the mind; moreover, they wilfully ignore the lesson of daily experience which tells us that the reason why young

¹ Board of Education, Educational Pamphlet No. 119, H.M.S.O.

people fall more frequently than others into sins of impurity is not so much because the mind is lacking in knowledge, as because the will, exposed to dangerous occasions and deprived of divine aids, is lacking in strength."¹

This modern biological method is therefore to be condemned. Three reasons for this condemnation are implicit in the Pope's words just quoted. First, it is based on the false principle that man is good of himself, and that any bad tendencies he may show, or bad moral habits he may acquire, must be due merely to ignorance. Original sin is overlooked, whereby "our natural inclinations are prone to evil from our very childhood". Secondly, since the only defect is thought to be ignorance, only the intellectual difficulty is faced, and practically no attention is paid to the greater moral difficulty. Some books, it is true, do speak vaguely of "civic responsibility", "social behaviour", but most of them do not even mention moral behaviour. They regard sex education and the dispelling of ignorance as an end in itself, on the dangerous principle that all knowledge is good, even for young children. Thirdly, this method is wrong because the instruction given is far too full, and is quite unnecessary. They assume that full knowledge will necessarily lead to good behaviour. You would be appalled to see the anatomical charts of the sexual organs and of the growth of the unborn child which are on show at the Science Masters' Association meetings: they are detailed enough for medical students, yet are intended as part of the ordinary school sex education of boys and girls of thirteen and fourteen. As the Scottish Bishops say, "The history of the world has not yet furnished proof of any need of detailed lessons in sexual physiology." The effect of such instruction is not to satisfy curiosity but to increase it by feeding the imagination.

Unfortunately, not only is this type of sex instruction becoming increasingly popular, but there are some signs that attempts will be made to make it obligatory in all schools.² We Catholics will be able to defeat such attempts only if we can prove that we have our own solution to the problem, and that we are putting that solution into practice.

¹ *Christian Education of Youth*, Pope Pius XI. C.T.S., S.99.

² Cf. recent developments in the London County Council schools.

It must be noted that the Government pamphlet does recognize that the duty belongs primarily to the parents, and that the burden is put on the teacher only because the parents will not do their duty. "The first approaches to the subject are probably best made," says the pamphlet, "not through any formal instruction, but by dealing sensibly with the questions of the individual child from early years. . . . Children who have gained their knowledge gradually in this way will require no set instruction in the physiology as a particular topic at a later stage."

We come now to the third possible way of treating the problem, based on principles laid down by Popes and Bishops.

Perhaps you think we have been a long time in coming to the point. We have, and quite deliberately. Because obviously there would have been little use in giving what seems to be the correct solution if, when you heard it, you were to shrug your shoulders and shirk the responsibility of putting that solution into practice. From our examination of the first attitude to the problem we concluded that to ignore the problem would be to fail in our duty, and that something must be done, and you are the persons to do it. From our examination of the non-Catholic method of sex instruction we saw that the Church does not require, and in fact does not wish, a very full factual instruction. We have already quoted the Scottish Bishops as saying that "some *minimum* knowledge of the facts of life is necessary". They say elsewhere, "It must be given individually and must comprise a *minimum* of factual knowledge." So great detail is not required. What needs doing is well within your powers. It is surprising how little knowledge your child really needs, but that little is essential to his peace of mind.

At this point we must be quite clear about our aim. What exactly are we trying to do for our children? The Scottish Bishops give the aim of Catholic sex instruction very clearly: "Its sole purpose should be to assist the formation of the virtue of purity." It is of vital importance to keep that aim clearly in mind when we are discussing the problem, or when we are actually talking to our children. Non-religious methods have quite different aims; we cannot accept such aims or such methods. For us, the ignorance of our children about the facts of life is important and must

be dispelled, but only because ignorance increases the spiritual difficulties. We give sex instruction only because ignorance can endanger purity.

The principle on which we act follows at once from our aim. Fr Vermeersch expresses it this way: "Natural ignorance is not necessarily to be dispelled, nor is artificial ignorance necessarily to be fostered; the explanation of sexual matters which we approve of," he says, "is not that which increases but that which diminishes worry in these matters."¹

With this aim, and acting on this principle, we want to help our children in the two difficulties they experience:

1. Their intellectual difficulty. They need to be told what is necessary. The knowledge they need will of course depend on their age and mental development. In general, however, we may think of two stages of knowledge:

- (a) A knowledge of childbirth, which we may call the mother's part in reproduction, and
- (b) A knowledge of the marriage act and the act of fertilization, or what we may call the father's part in reproduction.

As far as information goes, little more than these two facts are needed. With this knowledge the child can understand the birth of a baby; he can understand the changes taking place in his² own body; and he can understand the increasing attraction which he feels towards the opposite sex. But as much knowledge as this is necessary for serenity and purity.

2. We also want to help our children in their moral and spiritual difficulty. After giving the necessary minimum knowledge we must help them to put this knowledge into its right setting. We want them to realize that these newly discovered powers and attractions are intended and implanted in them by God, and that they are clean and good, but that they are to be used only as God intends. The realization of these points of Catholic doctrine will make purity reasonable, and therefore easier to practise. So our aim will be achieved.

¹ *De Castitate*, §191.

² The continuous repetition of "his or her" . . . would prove monotonous. Therefore let "his", "him", denote your child, whether boy or girl, throughout the whole of this paper.

This is what we wish to do. Here are some practical hints which may help you.

First, concerning the knowledge they need.

We want to tell them something of childbirth. There is no difficulty about this. You can tell them as soon as they ask you about it. There is no question here of whether you should give them the information of your own accord. You are quite safe in waiting until your children ask you about it. But when they ask you, do not hedge. To tell them the stork story will undermine the confidence of your child in your answers, and later in life he will be much less inclined to come to you for information. The Holy Father says: "Train the minds of your children. Do not give them wrong ideas or wrong reasons for things; whatever their questions may be, do not answer them with evasions or untrue statements which their minds rarely accept."¹ The knowledge that a child grows up inside its mother for nine months, and then is born from her, will only increase your child's love for you its mother. You can give them an example from the feasts of the Church. Have you ever realized that the Church celebrates the Birthday of Our Lady on 8 September, exactly nine months after her Immaculate Conception on 8 December, and the Birthday of Our Lord exactly nine months after the Annunciation? Tell them that. The Church herself is quite open about it. And you might quote the words of the Hail Mary, to make sure that they understand them: "and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus".

Of course all this explanation must be given delicately and discreetly. And along with it you should try to give your child a positive training in modesty, by gently teaching it to touch and to speak about these parts of the body only when it is necessary. It may happen, for instance, that they ask you some embarrassing question in front of visitors. Or you may see your children fingering themselves or guilty of some misbehaviour which may be embarrassing to watch, but which in their minds is probably not wrong at all. Do not be harsh with them. Correct them gently, as a lesson in modesty. And let the reason you give them for being modest be that these parts are sacred, and must not be handled without reason; not that they are dirty or nasty.

¹ Pius XII, *The Pope Speaks to Mothers*, 26 Oct., 1941. C.T.S., S.168.

So much for the knowledge of childbirth, which may be given even to young children. For the time being they do not need further knowledge, and I advise you not to tell them of the father's part just yet. Often their questions seem to be asking for this information, when in reality the child is not seeking it. For example, if they ask how a baby starts to grow, they are perfectly satisfied if you answer that a mother can feel the baby begin to grow inside her. "Unveil the truth as far as it appears necessary." And answers of this kind, the truth yet not the full truth, can be given to similar questions.

When it becomes necessary, we also want to tell them something of the father's part. It is not necessary for your children to know of this when very young; but sooner or later, as they become older, the information will be really necessary.

The Pope gives this advice: "... you will not fail to watch for and to discern the moment in which certain unspoken questions have occurred to their minds and are troubling their senses. It will then be your duty (mothers) to your daughters, the father's duty to your sons, carefully and delicately to unveil the truth as far as it appears necessary, to give a prudent, true, and Christian answer to those questions, and set their minds at rest. If imparted by the lips of Christian parents at the proper time, in the proper measure, and with the proper precautions, the revelation of the mysterious and marvellous laws of life will be received by them with reverence and gratitude, and will enlighten their minds with far less danger than if they learned them haphazard, from some disturbing encounter, from secret conversations, through information received from over-sophisticated companions, or from clandestine reading, the more dangerous and pernicious as secrecy inflames the imagination and troubles the senses. Your words," the Pope concludes, "if they are wise and discreet, will prove a safeguard and a warning in the midst of the temptations and corruption which surrounds them."¹

It is clear from this that the Pope wishes parents to watch over the minds of their growing children. When a child is very young curiosity instantly finds expression in questions. But from about ten onwards, shyness may prevent his asking questions

¹ Pius XII, *The Pope Speaks to Mothers*, 26 October, 1941. C.T.S., S.168.

even when he is curious. Therefore you must encourage your child to voice the "unspoken questions" which you believe to be present in his mind. After he is ten it will become increasingly probable that he is really seeking knowledge of the father's part, and if you can make sure that this is what he is after, you should be ready to tell him of it. The precise age at which curiosity begins will depend on his mental development, his friends, and his surroundings.¹ But whether he will ask you for help depends on his character and on his confidence in you, based on the way you have treated his questions in the past.

His curiosity, if it exists, will still be quite unemotional, and therefore will be less difficult for you to satisfy. Encourage him again to practise modesty by not touching or talking about these things, especially in the school playground. Tell him straight out that it is a sin to be immodest.

We have spoken of those children who show curiosity. But there are very many who can live through these years without the slightest desire to know anything further. They have no difficulties whatever, and for the present should be left in this contented state of mind.

But by the time your girl is beginning her monthly periods at somewhere about thirteen, and by the time your boy experiences his first night-loss of seed, at about fourteen, they need fuller information. And this is true whether they show any curiosity or not. In point of fact they do begin to worry, to a greater or less extent. They become anxious about its meaning, and may even imagine that they have caught some disease. We want to prevent this harmful worry and anxiety, and to forestall the possible formation of bad habits in thought and in action. Therefore it is our duty to speak to them, whether they ask our help or not.

Unfortunately, American statistics show that the majority of parents keep putting it off until their children have already found out for themselves. Don't do that. If necessary, fix a precise day on which you will speak. For example, it might be as well if you made up your mind beforehand to talk to your girl on her thirteenth birthday, and to your boy on his fourteenth

¹ "The sex instinct awakens in different children at different ages" (Scottish Bishops).

birthday, unless it becomes obvious, as it may do, that they need your help before then. This ties you down to a definite day and overcomes the temptation to keep putting it off.

Besides, you will find it far easier to talk to your child at this age than later, when he has begun to be awkward and self-conscious because of his growing emotions.¹

You might speak to your child when you are both out for a walk. You will be less liable to interruption, and it will be less awkward for him to be told in this way than when having to sit facing you while you talk to him at home.

We will assume that your child has shown no curiosity whatever since he learned years ago that a baby grows inside its mother for nine months before she gives it birth. We will assume, in other words, that he has to be told everything it is necessary for him to know. The ideal would be for your child to have learned most of these facts from you gradually and naturally through the years, so that at this stage all you would have to do would be to explain the physical changes coming upon him, and to talk to him about purity.

We will consider your boy and your girl in turn.

You mothers could talk to your girl in this way:

"Now that you are grown up there are a few things I want to explain to you. You remember I told you that a baby grows up inside its mother's womb for nine months and then is born. It starts to grow from a tiny egg the size of a pin point. But before this can begin to grow it must be joined by a special liquid called 'seed', which is passed into the body of a woman by her husband when their bodies come together and join. And the parts they use are the parts by which she is a woman and the parts by which he is a man: I mean the parts they use to get rid of waste water from the body. And after nine months the woman gives birth to her baby: it comes through the same opening. If the 'seed' has met a tiny egg and made it able to grow, this is called the conception of the child. It is the moment when the baby begins to live. At that moment God Himself creates the baby's soul. So the conception of a child is a sacred act, shared in by its mother, its father, and God. Now you see

¹ Cf. J. Leycester King, S.J. *Sex Enlightenment and the Catholic*, chap. xi. This book includes many Papal and Episcopal pronouncements on the subject.

why I have always taught you to use this part of your body reverently and modestly.

"There's something else. Have you ever been bleeding at this part of the body? It's nothing to be frightened about: in fact, it is perfectly natural and healthy, and shows you are fully grown up. It is blood which contains the tiny egg we have talked about. Your body produces one every month. But since you are not married yet, your body doesn't need it and gets rid of it. This is called your monthly period." (For the rest of the talk, see p. 316.)

And you fathers could give a very similar explanation to your boy.

"Now that you are grown up, there are a few things I'd like to explain to you. You know already that a baby grows inside its mother's womb for nine months, and then she gives birth to her baby. It begins to grow from a tiny egg the size of a pin point. But before it can begin to grow it must be joined by a special liquid called 'seed'. This comes from the body of her husband, and is passed into her body when their bodies come together and join. And the parts they use are the parts by which she is a woman, and the parts by which he is a man: I mean the parts used by both to get rid of waste water from the body. When a baby is born, it comes through the same opening. If the seed does happen to meet a tiny egg, this moment is called the moment of conception of the child. At that moment the baby begins to live, because at that moment God Himself creates the baby's soul. So the conception of a child is a sacred act, shared in by its mother, its father, and God. Now you see why I have always taught you to use this part of your body reverently and modestly.

"But there's something else. Have you ever noticed the part you use to get rid of waste water becoming stiff and swollen? That sometimes happens. And have you ever noticed during the night this part of your body giving out the special liquid—'seed'—that I talked about? You may have wakened up while this was happening, or you may not. I want to warn you never to take deliberate pleasure in either of these things when they happen. You can't help them happening, but you must not take pleasure in them. That would be impurity, and a sin. The rea-

son for these changes in your body is simple. Your body is now grown up, and is beginning to make 'seed'. But until you are married it won't be needed, so your body gets rid of it every few weeks while you are asleep." (For the rest of this talk see p. 316.)

These two explanations are given only as an example, to show the amount of knowledge needed, and the way in which it might be worded. The explanation could be improved upon if you could make it a conversation rather than a talk. But this depends very much on the character of your child, and on how readily he will chat with you, and tell what he already knows or wants to know.

This is all the information about sexual things which they should need, but they do need all this, and as clearly put as this. Unless you are quite straightforward and quite clear, you will not set their minds at rest.

Short as they are, there are a few details in which these explanations of the physical facts differ from those given in most books on sex instruction, whether Catholic or non-Catholic.

It will be noticed that little has been said of the inside of the body. Children are not usually curious about what happens inside. It is information as to externals that they want and need.

Further, the scientific terms for the various parts of the body have not been used. They do not seem necessary. Besides, most parents are unfamiliar with the terms, and would not be ready in their use of the words. Further, it would be necessary to explain what these new words mean, and such descriptions can cause a good deal of embarrassment. It is this explanation of scientific terms in books on sex instruction, and the description of the parts of the body to which they refer, which causes most criticism, and even disgust, in the minds of Catholic readers. Such descriptions and scientific terms are unnecessary, provided that you can let your child know, delicately yet quite clearly, what parts of the body you mean. "The parts by which she is a woman, and the parts by which he is a man" may be sufficient, or may not. It depends on whether your child knows the bodily difference between a boy and a girl. Just to make sure, add the alternative sentence: "I mean the parts used by them both to get rid of waste water from the body." This statement is true

for externals, and it is only about externals that they are interested.

Nor have the explanations included any examples of fertilization in plants and animals. Surely the fact that a union is necessary before the egg-cell can begin to develop is not hard to understand. Therefore such examples are not necessary. Presumably most books give them to supply some of the knowledge that a child would have acquired naturally had he been brought up in the country. Such a deficiency cannot be made good in one talk or in one book. Therefore, since these examples are not necessary to our present purpose, we do well to omit them. The omission will help to keep our explanation on as lofty and as elevated a plane as possible.

Our sole aim has been to give the information necessary to foster purity. We have tried, therefore, to say nothing more and nothing less than is necessary to achieve our aim. Catholic sex instruction must not be allowed to become tainted by the excesses of non-Catholic biological methods. We keep our talk on a spiritual plane: we do not give unnecessary knowledge; we do not use unnecessary scientific terms; and, rather than take examples from plants and animals, we prefer illustrations from the feasts and doctrines of the Church. Of course, if the topic of fertilization or other such topic were to arise later on, our knowledge of biology and nature study could help our answer; we speak here only of the first approach to the subject, where the tone set is of supreme importance.

But let us finish the talk you were giving to your child. You have given him the facts he needs. But you must not stop there. To help him to put this knowledge into perspective you must say something to him about purity and self-control, about Our Lady and grace. This is of great importance to spiritualize the whole subject and to foster the virtue of purity, which is our whole aim.

To both boy and girl you can speak in practically the same way.

"We've talked about the changes that take place in your body when you grow up. But you have probably noticed another thing, that you are beginning to be attracted towards boys (girls) in your thoughts and mind. This attraction which you are beginning to feel, and will feel all your life, is perfectly good. God makes us that way. But God means this attraction to be used in

the right way, and not just for our pleasure. It is meant to help two people to love one another, and when they are married, to have children. After people are married, all these acts of love, to which they feel attracted, are perfectly good and perfectly holy, and God really wants married people to enjoy them. But only married people—no one else. So until you are married you must keep a perfect control over your thoughts and over your actions. That is purity. It needs great strength and grace to do it, because sometimes these attractions and temptations are very strong—but that is exactly why purity is such a great virtue, especially if you keep pure in order to please God.

"It is such an important matter that if you deliberately—really deliberately—seek for pleasure from this part of your body, either by yourself or with anyone else, it is a mortal sin of impurity, and must be told in confession. It is because purity is so good that impurity is so evil.

"But this needn't frighten you; you will keep pure if you try to please God and pray for grace. Pray to Our Lady. She is the Mother of God, and therefore the model of mothers and all married people. But she is the model of unmarried people as well, and in a special way. Because God worked a miracle, by which Our Lord 'was conceived in His Mother's womb by the Holy Ghost, without the seed of man'.¹ Our Lady never received the seed of man into her body. That is what we mean by a virgin. So because she is a Virgin, Our Lady is also the model of all who are unmarried. Copy her. Pray to her. She will help you."

Lastly, encourage your child to come to you in any future difficulty. "If ever there is anything you want to know, come and ask me. Now that you are grown up, you need to know these things. I promise to help you. As you get older, you will find it difficult to speak about these things. That is because God has given us modesty, a natural shyness to prevent our leading ourselves and others into temptation. Modesty guards purity. If we do not touch or talk about these parts unless we need to, we shall certainly keep pure. But if it is really necessary, you should try to overcome your natural shyness and ask me or the priest in confession."

If you can manage something along those lines you will

¹ Nicholas Love, Prior of Mount Grace, Charterhouse (1410-1420).

have given your child great help. More than has been given here is not necessary. When they first start work, and again when they are called up, you can warn them of the many people they will meet who have deserted the ideal of purity and whose whole conversation is immodest and even impure. But do not do that now. In this introduction to sex matters it is better not to mention impurity more than is necessary. We try to emphasize the positive side, purity.

This talk will cost you an effort. But you can prepare yourself for it. Firstly, make sure that you have the right Christian attitude to sex. That may seem a strange thing to say, but many parents find this duty difficult because they themselves, owing to mistaken ideas, feel that there is something shameful about these sexual pleasures, even in marriage. This notion is utterly wrong. Between man and wife these love acts are perfectly good and holy actions. The Scottish Bishops wish that "this principle should be clearly taught to all adolescents".

Secondly, you can prepare yourself by prayer and by thinking over carefully what you are going to say, and how you are going to say it. If you doubt your powers to give a talk on these lines, you can at least read the explanation and the talk on purity given here. Tell him you have found something in a book that might be helpful to him.

It is certainly a difficult task. But remember that when you were married you received the sacrament of Matrimony. This is not a sacrament that is over and done with on your wedding day; it lasts all through your married life, and gives you a right to all the graces you need to do your duty as parents, including this duty of sex instruction and training in purity. The grace of God is there in the sacrament to help you.

As your child grows older you will always be thankful that you did your best to help him. By treating sex as a common-sense subject, and purity as a common-sense virtue, and by talking to your child about them, you will have given him very great help. Beyond this, your personal example, your home life, and the grace he receives in the sacraments, will see him through successfully "from the unconscious purity of infancy to the triumphant purity of adolescence".

REV. AIDAN PICKERING, M.A.

THE MYSTICAL NAMES OF MARY

TO the Jews the books of Holy Scripture were full of mysteries. "Clausi sunt signatique sunt sermones usque ad praefinitum tempus", as the Angel said to Daniel.¹ Though our Lord made it known to the Pharisees that the time of fulfilment had come "scrutamini Scripturas . . . illae sunt, quae testimonium perhibent de me",² their intrinsic obscurity still conceals something of their riches, some of which are even unsuspected. Nor is this only to hide the sanctities they contain from the prying eye of the impious.

The main purpose of Holy Scripture is clear: to instruct us about eternal life, and Him who would be our means of attaining it. "Vos putatis in ipsis vitam aeternam habere."³ St Paul explains further their utility: "Utilis est (Scriptura) ad *docendum*, ad arguendum, ad corripiendum, ad *erudiendum* in iustitia; ut perfectus sit homo Dei, ad omne opus bonum instructus . . ."⁴ Quaecumque scripta sunt ad nostram doctrinam scripta sunt ut per *patientiam*, et *consolationem* Scripturarum, spem habeamus."⁵

Not everything in Holy Scripture is dogma and morality, nor even the raw material from which the living traditional Church elaborates them. Christ came to found a Kingdom; but there is more in a kingdom than law, custom and sanction. Christ came to found a school of divine knowledge, but there is more in the work of instruction than the enunciation of principles.

In a kingdom there is a psychological atmosphere, which enters into the life of the people. Witness Russia today: fear, mutual suspicion, servility to a tyrannous state, the purge, the concentration camp, all these make up the psychological atmosphere of the Soviet State; they are becoming part of the background of the people's mind. In Holy Scripture is to be found the spirit of Christianity; and it can be absorbed, even without a clear understanding of much that is written there. Just as we absorbed much of the spirit of our own country, not by a clear understanding of all that it is made up of, but by living in it; by

¹ Dan. xii, 8.² 2 Tim. iii, 16-17.³ John v, 39.⁴ John I.e.⁵ Rom. xv, 4.

being initiated from childhood into its folklore, its fairy tales and something of its history. Splendid and exciting as they may have appeared to us as children, they were obscure and mysterious to our understanding . . . but they were effective in inculcating the spirit of our native land.

In a school there is much more than the propounding of facts and principles; a teacher can teach nothing if there is no atmosphere of confidence and expectancy felt among the pupils; his efforts will fail if he has no similes, or illustrations, or symbols to interest and enlighten them; no mysteries to awaken curiosity; no promises to sustain effort, when difficulties stand in the path. The Church is the teacher, we the pupils; the Scriptures are her handbook, to which we have free access; there, are to be found all the accessories of the teaching art.

Since the rationalism of the last century with its scepticism and its textual criticism, Catholic scholars have rightly concentrated on critical studies of the text and its meaning; but this very concentration has led to a certain neglect—dare we say disdain?—for the symbolical and illustrative aspect of Holy Scripture; yet it was very dear to our Fathers in the ages of Faith. Who has not heard the Middle Ages belittled for what is called “their excessive allegorizing and over-fondness for the mystical sense of the sacred text”? We believe that a more thorough study of the mystical interpretations of the Middle Ages would reveal much more that is objectively well founded and based on firm Tradition than is at present supposed. The comprehension of the Liturgy today is less perfect, its execution less profitable, in the measure that this side of Holy Scripture is less studied and less understood. What St Augustine says about the symbolical sense of Scripture remains true. “. . . All those things which are conveyed to us in figures are the proper fuel for love. For they move us more, and make our love burn more brightly than bleak propositions, unclothed in image or analogy. It is difficult to say why, but so it is: *anything* that is proposed by allegory is more moving, more delightful and more attended to than if it were proposed in the plainest, most unimaginative language. I am convinced that the soul’s very power of reacting is rather sluggish so long as it is immersed in earthliness. But offer it corporeal images; lead it on thence to the

spiritual realities they prefigure, and the very passage from one to the other will quicken it; it bursts into flame like the fire in a bundle of twigs that is shaken up; and by the ardour of its delight it is carried away towards contemplation."¹

An argument that has always appeared to the present writer to be highly probable is this: The entire Bible is concerned in some way with our Lord and his Kingdom; but during His earthly Life we always find Him associated with Our Lady. Therefore we should expect to find her constantly associated with Him and signified in some way in the books which refer prophetically to His earthly destiny. However, direct references to her in the Old Testament, though important, are relatively few; therefore the typical or symbolical references ought to be the more numerous.

The mediaeval poem, here published, contains eighty-five images of Our Lady, and may well serve as an introduction to the verification of this thesis. All these images are traceable to one or more texts of Holy Scripture, and without exception they are found to have some kind of backing in the writings of the Fathers, especially in those of St John Damascene. They are drawn from light and natural phenomena; from habitations and worship; from water and maritime life; from persons, gems and perfumes, the earth and rural life; in short from the whole range of human experience. Taken together they give us a true picture of the omnipresence of Mary in the Christian life. And yet, it is interesting to note, they do not exhaust the possible symbols of Mary in the Bible, which have been mentioned as such in the writings of the Fathers. Take for example the prophetic dream which the king of Babylon could not remember. Daniel told him what he had seen; the composite statue which stood firm until the stone, riven from the mountain *sine manibus*, struck it. "Videbas ita, donec abscissus est lapis de monte sine manibus, et percussit statuam in pedibus ejus ferreis et fictilibus, et comminuit eos . . . lapis autem qui percusserat statuam, factus est mons magnus, et implevit universam terram."² "Lapis" is perhaps one of the best authenticated symbols of Christ in the whole Bible. The mountain from which it came, *sine manibus*, seems therefore to be a symbol of Mary who bore our Lord, *sine semine*.

¹ St Aug., *Epist. LV ad Jan. Inq.*, P.L. 33, c. 214.
Vol. xxxi

² Dan. ii, 34, 35.
Z

There are many other examples, e.g. the little cloud coming up from the sea, followed by the rain which saved the land from starvation;¹ or the table on which were placed the loaves of proposition (a symbol of our eucharistic Lord).²

The practical utility of all these figures is great for all who make a study of the Liturgy; but especially for those whose life is built around the recitation of the Divine Office. By means of them Our Lady can be brought into her proper place in the life of liturgical prayer. Adverting to our blessed Mother each time one of her mystical names occurs in the Office has a value which has only to be tested to be appreciated.

THE MYSTICAL NAMES OF MARY

*Sicut pratum picturatur
Et ver vernis floribus,
Mater Dei figuratur
Mysticis nominibus.*

As spring flowers make a picture
Of the meadow and the spring,
So God's Mother is depicted
By her titles mystical.

*Haec est nostra Sunamitis,
Nostra Tympanistria,
Via vitae, vera vitis,
Et cella vinaria.*

She is our own Sunamitess
And our (joyful) Tympanist;
Way of life, true vine is she, and
Cellar built to store the wine.

*Haec est sponsa Salomonis,
Fermamentrix femina;
Qua vetusta Pharaonis
Relevatur sarcina.*

This is Solomon's fair spouse, and
This is she who leaven hid
By her means the ancient burden
Laid by Pharaoh lifted is.

*Haec lucerna paradisi,
Ostium et janua.
Haec vervecis est occisi
Genetrix ingenua.*

She the lamp of Paradise is;
She, the door and opening;
Of the victim-Lamb unspotted,
Genetrix illustrious.

*Haec est scala, qua descendit
Calceata divinitas.
Hoc est littus, ad quod tendit
Nostra molis gravitas.*

She the ladder, whence descended
The Divinity in shoes.
She the shore, to which the weight of
Our (dead) mass (by nature) tends.

*Haec est mundi medicina,
Munda, purgans lolium,
Haec est rosa sine spina,
Castitatis lilium.*

She, the sick world's medicine is;
Pure, she purges out the tares.
She the rose without a thorn, and
Lily fair of chastity.

¹ 3 Kings xviii, 44.

² Exod. xxv, 30 et alibi.

THE MYSTICAL NAMES OF MARY 323

Haec est turris quam vallavit
Incorrupta firmitas.
Hoc castellum quod intravit
Sola Verbi veritas.

Haec est scirpea fiscella,
Parvulum excipiens.
Haec est parens, et puella
Sine patre pariens.

Virgo, virga nuncuparis,
Templum, vas, sacrarium;
Porta clausa, lux solaris,
Coeli luminarium.

Rubus ardens, madens vellus,
Gedeonis area;
Fons signatus, ferax tellus,
Granum sine palea;

Gemma, jubar, lac, talentum,
Spes et laus prophetica;
Cinnamomus, ros, unguentum
Quo fugatur toxica;

Gutta, nardus, mel, pigmentum,
Radix aromatica;
Palma, palmes, pavimentum,

Piscina probatica;

Botrus, uva, favus, hortus,
Thalamus, triclinium;
Arca, navis, aura, portus,

Luna, lampas, atrium;

Vitrum, urna, claustrum, cella,
Domus, aula, civitas;
Fons, fenestra, lumen, stella,
Sol, aurora, claritas.

Tu columba, tu columna,
Tu vitta coccinea.
Tu es alatrix, tu alumna,

Tu Engeddi vinca.

This, the keep, whose rampart was her
Unperverted constancy;
This the castle, where the Word's lone
Truth made entrance and abode.

This the rush-made floating cradle
That received the little Babe;
This the Mother and the Maiden;
Fatherless, the Child she bears.

Virgin, thou art called the Temple,
Vessel, Rod and Treasury;
Portal closed and solar Light; the
Brilliant Orb, that shines in Heav'n.

Burning Bush and dripping Fleece, on
Threshing floor of Gideon,
Fountain sealed, the fertile Earth, and
Grain of corn without the chaff.

Thou, the Gem, Ray, Milk and Talent,
Hope and Praise prophetic;
Cinnamon, the Dew, the Ointment
Whence the arrow's poison flees.

Spikenard, Drop, Honey, Pigment,
Root-stock aromatic;
Thou, the Pavement, Palm and Vine-
sprig,
And the pool "Probatika";

Honeycomb, Bunch, Grape and Garden,
Marriage-bed and Banquet-hall;
Thou, the Ship, Breeze, Ark and Gate-
way,
Moon and Lamp and Vestibule;

Cristal, Urn, the Cell, the Cloister,
City, Hall and holy House;
Fountain, Star; the Light and Window,
Dawn and Sun and Radiance.

Thou, the Dove, and thou, the Column
Thou, the scarlet-coloured Thread;
Thou, the Nurse, and thou, the Nurs-
ling,
Thou, Engeddi's wondrous Vine.

Tui Patris tu, Maria,
Mater es et filia.
Ergo Patri, Mater pia,
Nos reconcilia. Amen.

Thou, thy Father's art, O Mary,
Mother, Yes! and Daughter, too.
Therefore us unto the Father,
Loving Mother, reconcile! Amen.

The poem is one of the treasures of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. It was discovered on the last page of a twelfth-century manuscript by Cardinal Pitra, and was published by him in the *Spicelgium Solesmense*.¹ The author is quite unknown, but the learned editor classes him with Adam of St Victor. The knowledge of the Bible that it displays is only equalled by the ingenuity of its versification. The metre is based on accents, though, as often in mediaeval poetry, some of the lines are based on quantity, e.g. verse ii, line 4, "et cella vinaria", and verse xii, line 4, "Piscina probatica". Considering the close packing of the figures in the later part it was no mean feat to produce these sixteen four-line stanzas of trochaic measure, with the second and fourth clipt, and rhyming in lines two and four, and one and three; some freedom of versification was no doubt necessary when using such a "strait-jacket" form. Whatever may be said of its poetical merits, there are undoubtedly touches of genuine poetical feeling in it, e.g.:

Verse V: Haec est scala, qua descendit
Calceata divinitas.

Verse VII: Hoc castellum quod intravit
Sola Verbi veritas.

These mystical names are culled from almost every Book of the Bible, and depend for the most part not on a single text, but on the collation of two or three, or a whole series. To determine objectively how far each belongs to the true mystical sense of Holy Scripture, and how far to liturgical accommodations, would be a study in itself. But some are sufficiently attested in the writings of the Fathers to have passed into current use, e.g. in the litany of Loretto, viz. Mystical Rose, House of Gold. Others are testified but rarely by the Fathers, or only by St John Damascene; others seem to be founded on a certain natural analogy, e.g. Treasury.

¹ Vol. III, p. 450.

Many of these figures of Our Lady are very familiar, since they occur so frequently in the Divine Office. E.g. *civitas*, *porta*, *lilium*, *fons signatus*. To discuss the scriptural sources of them all would be too lengthy for an article; however, some of them are sufficiently interesting or *recherché* to call for some comment as they reveal something of the poet's mind at work.

Example I, verse iii :

. . .
 Fermamentrix femina;
 Qua vetusta Pharaonis
 Relevatur sarcina.

It is rather surprising to find the liberation from the slavery of Egypt linked up with the woman in the gospel parable, who took some leaven and hid it in three measures of meal.¹ In the beginning of the Book of Exodus it is related how Pharaoh "posuit eis (the Hebrews) magistros operum, ut affligerent eos oneribus".² Then there follows the account of the slavery of Egypt from whose burdens they were only finally delivered when they walked dry-foot through the fissure opened for them in the Red Sea and the pursuing Egyptians had been swallowed up by the returning waters. "Liberavitque Dominus in die illa Israel de manu Aegyptiorum."³ It seems that they became linked up by a very natural association of ideas. The fermentation of yeast causes the dough to rise; the rounded appearance of a lump of dough that has risen would suggest a round bundle (*sarcina*); whereas the lightening of the bread would suggest the lightening of a burden, and the freeing of the Israelites had the effect of relieving them of the burden of slavery. The connexion of the two passages with one another and with Our Lady becomes immediately obvious when they are interpreted in the mystical sense. Namely, Mary is the woman who hid the three measures of meal, i.e. Our Lord among the three states of mankind, men, women and children, and they are to be lifted up by Him into the state of grace. The passing of the Red Sea was also a symbol of mankind receiving sanctifying grace through Baptism. Mary's

¹ Math. xiii, 33; Luc. xiii, 21.

² Exod. i, 11.

³ Exod. xiv, 30.

"fiat" to the Incarnation was the starting point of our Lord's redemptive work, which gave its efficacy to the Sacrament of Baptism.

Example II. Subsequent to the delivery of Israel, Mary the prophetess, sister of Moses and Aaron, took the timbrel in her hand, and went dancing and singing with the women of Israel, to celebrate their deliverance.¹ Here she is the type of our blessed Mother rejoicing over those who have been baptized and received into the Mystical Body of Christ,² or over those who have entered into Heaven the land of promise.³ Hence in the previous stanza Our Lady is hailed as our joyful Tympanist.

Example III. The fifth verse has the following interesting lines in it:

Haec est scala, qua descendit
Calceata Divinitas.

Scala obviously refers to the ladder of Jacob's dream,⁴ which he saw standing on the earth with its top touching the heavens, and the Lord leaning over it. The angels were the messengers of God, who speak for Him, and as it were take His place. E.g. when the angel spoke to Abraham when he was about to kill Isaac for a sacrifice the angel spoke as though he were God himself.⁵ "Calceata divinitas" recalls to mind several messianic texts. First one from the prophet Micheas, "quia ecce Dominus egredietur de loco suo; et descendet et *calcabit* super excelsa terrae".⁶ Then the one from the canticle of Habacuc "Deus ab austro veniet, et Sanctus de monte Pharan. . . . Ante faciem ejus ibit mors; et egredietur diabolus ante *pedes* ejus: et *stetit*, et mensus est terram."⁷ The next from Nahum's vision of the Messias "Ecce super montes *pedes* evangelizantis, et annuntiantis pacem." When St John the Baptist pointed out our Lord he said "Ecce agnus Dei. . . . Ipse est qui post me venturus est, qui ante me factus est, cujus ego non sum dignus ut solvam ejus corrigiam *calceamenti*."⁸ To which we might add the words of the Messias

¹ Exod. xv, 20, 21.

² Pet. de Riga Aur. in *Exod* v, lines 987 seq.

³ Joan. Dam. Hom. iii in *Dorm.* PG 96, c. 758.

⁴ Gen. xxviii, 12, 13.

⁵ Gen. xviii, 13-18.

⁶ Mich. i, 3.

⁷ Hab. iii, 375; Nah. i, 15.

⁸ Jon. i, 29 and 27.

in Isaias' vision, "torcular *calcavi* solus . . . *calcavi* eos in furore meo et *conculcavi* eos in ira mea".¹ In his *Testimonia adversus Judaeos*, St Cyprian explains the mystical signification of "calceatus", as the bridegroom, the one who should have the bride.² This, I think, fills out the meaning of the lines of the poem: the divine nature descending with Mary as his ladder, to appear not only with human attributes, but as the bridegroom of humanity.

Example IV. The second half of the same verse:

Hoc est littus ad quod descendit
Nostra molis gravitas.

When Israel reached the borders of the Promised Land, spies were sent forward to explore it. They returned with tales of the great number and size of the inhabitants. The majority counselled a retreat, since they had no hope of conquest. There was a sedition among the people, who had lost confidence in God. As a punishment of their sin they were condemned to wander in the desert for forty years. When the time of their wandering was over, God spoke to them through Moses, and told them how they were to pass into the Land. "Revertimini, et venite ad montem Amorrhæorum, et ad *humiliora loca* contra meridiem, et *juxta littus maris*, etc."³ After their sin the way of return to God and the land of promise was by humility and by the way of Mary, symbolized by the sea-shore. The lowest point of the land to which the waters of the earth will flow, and to which all heavy bodies tend to fall, is the sea-shore. Hence the sea-shore is the type of Mary's extreme lowliness; she is the one to whom all the sinners of the earth will naturally turn, as their advocate with God.

When the ship on which St Paul was travelling to Rome as a prisoner was in danger through the storm, they sighted a creek, having a good *beach*.⁴ Drawing up the anchors, "comitabant se mari . . . secundum auræ flantem *tendebant ad littus*." The shore was the symbol of Mary, the refuge of sinners who are on the point of shipwreck; through her they find safety.

¹ Is. lxiii, 3 seq.

² Deut. i, 7.

³ PL. 4, c. 746. Cf. Ruth iv, 7-9.

⁴ Acts xxvii, 39, 40.

In the Gospel, St Matthew tells us that all the people were *on the shore*, while Jesus sat in the boat and taught them. In the light of the symbolism of the "shore", we may take a further lesson from the Gospel incident: if we come to Mary, through her we shall receive the best of our Lord's instruction.¹ Furthermore in that other scene by the sea-shore, where St Paul was saying good-bye to the Christians at Tyre, this symbol offers another mystical instruction. We read that they prayed together "*positis genibus in littore*";² which seems to insinuate symbolically that we should be united with Mary when we pray.

Example V, verse viii:

Scirpea fiscella.

This was the basket of bulrushes, daubed with slime and pitch, into which Moses was laid as an infant.³ If our Lord was typified by Moses—and to this all agree—it seems fitting that Mary, in whom He reposed for nine months, should be symbolized by the floating Cradle.

Example VI, verse ii:

Spes et laus prophetica.

We will begin with the latter; it seems to be intended objectively, i.e. as the "object" of praise, and to refer to the Book of Judith. When Judith returned from the slaying of Holofernes she was welcomed by the ancients and the assembly of the people. They addressed her with a long speech in which she was told "*et non recedat laus tua de ore hominum*".⁴ From the Liturgy we gather that Judith slaying Holofernes was the type of Mary, bringing about the downfall of Satan. Hence the praise that was given prophetically to Judith was intended finally for Our Lady. It was the Angel that set the ball of praise of Mary rolling. "*Benedicta tu in mulieribus*."⁵ The same salutation was taken up soon after by St Elisabeth, "*Benedicta tu inter mulieres*."⁶ Mary, herself, in her Canticle announces the

¹ xiii, 2.

⁴ Judith xiii, 25.

² Acts xxi, 5.

⁵ Luc. i, 28.

³ Exod. ii, 3.

⁶ l.c. 42.

fulfilment of the prophetical praise given to Judith, "Ecce ex hoc beata *me* dicent omnes generationes."¹ Soon after a woman of her own race and generation took up the cry, when she said to our Lord, "Beatus venter qui te portavit et ubera quae suxisti."²

As for Mary as "*spes prophetica*"; we salute her daily (in the *Salve regina*) as "*vita dulcedo et spes nostra*". Let us look at the origins of this title in the Bible.

When Adam had sinned by eating the forbidden fruit, death was to be his recompense. Before passing the terrible sentence, "pulvis es et in pulverem reverteris",³ God turned to the instrument of Adam's fall and passed judgement on him first. A weak woman was to be the cause of his final defeat, as Eve had been the cause of his victory over man, "Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, etc." Hence the judgement of the Serpent was at the same time a message of hope for man, that he should again recover his lost friendship with God. Hence Mary was to be *the hope* that was prophesied to mankind.

As the centuries went by various historical persons were raised up by God to act as figures and reminders of the Woman whose coming had been prophesied, and to sustain the hope of humanity. Among them was Esther. In the drama of the liberation of the Jews from the death sentence, extorted from Assuerus by guile, Esther played the part which Mary was to play in the liberation of the human race. She realized that she was the only hope of the Jews. Before entering, unbidden, into the presence of the unapproachable King, she said in her prayer, "Deus fortis super omnes, exaudi vocem eorum qui *nullam aliam spem* habent, et libera nos de manu iniquorum, et erue me a timore."⁴

Again, Mary was so closely conformed to her Son, Who was eternal Wisdom, that the Church sees in the description of wisdom in the Sapiential Books a description of Our Lady. Hence in the Offices of Our Lady she appears as "*mater pulchrae dilectionis . . . et sanctae spei*" and as saying, "In me *gratia omnis viae et veritatis*, in me omnis *spes vitae et virtutis*."⁵ Finally we may quote Psalm cxviii, 49: "memor esto verbi tui servo tuo, in quo mihi *spem* dedisti", which seems to be a reminiscence of the *protevangelium*.

¹ Lc. 48.

² Esth. xiv, 19.

³ Luc. xi, 27.

⁴ Eccli. xxiv, 24-5.

⁵ Gen. iii, 19.

Example VII, verse x :

Ferax tellus.

That Our Lady appears in the Old Testament under the symbol of the earth seems well attested. Archbishop Ullathorne, following St John Damascene¹ and others,² pays some attention to it in his book on the Immaculate Conception.³ We find it for instance in Psalm lxiv, 10 : "Thou hast visited the earth, and hast plentifully watered it; thou hast in many ways enriched it"; and again in Psalm lxxxiv, 12 : "Truth is sprung out of the earth"; v. 13 : "For the Lord will give goodness; and our earth shall yield her fruit",⁴ i.e. our Lord born a man from Mary. During the Advent Liturgy the verse from Isaias occurs repeatedly, "*Aperiat^rur terra et germinet salvatorem.*"⁵

Example VIII, verse xiii :

Aura.

There is an undefinable charm about that passage in the Books of Kings, where the Prophet heard the voice of God,⁶ not in the great wind, nor in the commotion, nor in the raging fire, but in the light whisper of the breeze. This seems a most fitting symbol of Mary; she appeals to us as speaking with the gentlest voice of God. Even in Genesis, when God⁷ sought Adam and Eve in anger, it was out of the afternoon breeze that he spoke to them. As if Mary were present, as she always is, to mitigate God's anger towards the sinner.

Such then is the poem of the mystical names of Mary, which we hope will serve to stimulate interest in the deeper symbolism of Holy Scripture. In trying to show something of the spirit that underlies it we hope to have said enough to establish that there is more in the mystical sense of Scripture than is commonly believed today. It is clear that the study of the mystical

¹ PG 96, Hom. I in *Dorm.*, c. 726 and 762; in *Nat. mar.*, c. 683.

² See *Spic. Sol.* II, p. 121 et alibi.

³ P. 34.

⁴ See also 4 Kings xviii, 32.

⁵ Is. xlv, 8, and Resp. "*Montes Israel . . .*", Fer III, post Dom. I Adv.

⁶ 3 Kings xix, 12.

⁷ Gen. iii, 8.

symbols of Our Lady in the Old Testament is of great interest, a great aid to scriptural studies in general, and it would be a great boon to all who lead a life of liturgical prayer to have an exhaustive monograph dealing with the whole subject.

ERIC P. WHEELER

EASTERN CHURCH MARRIAGE LAWS

IN the issue of *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* containing the *Motu Proprio* "Crebrae Allatae"¹ appears also an advertisement of three volumes, *Codificationis Canonicae Orientalis Fontes*, an extensive work still in course of publication. For the reasons explained by the Holy Father the portion of the projected Code of Eastern Canon Law relating to marriage has now been published in advance, a series of 131 canons divided as in our own Code into twelve chapters having identical titles. With the accompanying documents it occupies thirty pages of the official publication of the Holy See, and being far too long for a reprint in this journal its contents are summarized in the present article, and attention called to the chief points in which Eastern law differs from our own. To avoid confusion the word "canon" will be used for our own Code, and "number" contracted to "n" for references to the new document.

I

The principle underlying this very successful codification of laws is to achieve, as far as may be possible, some degree of conformity with Western laws, particularly with regard to the impediments and the canonical form of marriage. For the increasing facilities of movement about the world have made this eminently desirable, as many priests in this country have discovered in recent years when called upon to assist at the marriages of Eastern Catholics.

¹ *Infra*, p. 348.

The unifying purpose has been achieved more easily in those canons which define the natural or divine law about marriage, and many of them are absolutely and verbally identical, e.g. marriage consent in n. 72 and canon 1081, or the indissolubility of a ratified and consummated marriage in n. 107 and canon 1118. A notable exception is the omission of the very intricate analysis of conditioned consent in canon 1092, which n. 83 settles in a most satisfactory manner: "Matrimonium sub conditione contrahi nequit." People cannot, of course, be prevented from putting conditions to a contract, but it is open to the legislator to declare them all "pro non adiecta" as in canon 1092.1, and many of our own difficulties would disappear if we had something resembling n. 83 in our Code.

Conformity is also established in a number of positive enactments as in the law of banns (n. 13 seq. and canon 1023 seq.), marriage in *periculo mortis* (n. 89 and canon 1098), inscription in the baptismal register (n. 92, §2, and canon 1103, §2), and simple convalidation (n. 122 seq. and canon 1133 seq.). The identity is not always verbatim, and occasionally some small change in terminology is an improvement as, for example, "dispensatio ab impedimento" in place of "super impedimento". Throughout, of course, "Ordinarium" and "Diocesis" is replaced by "Hierarchia" and "Eparchia", and "Syncellus" appears to be the equivalent of "Vicarius Generalis".

II

Complete uniformity, however, is neither possible nor desirable, and in some important points the marriage law of the Oriental rites, now codified, differs considerably from our own.¹

The diriment impediments, though bearing the same names, have the following chief variations. Difference of worship in n. 60, §1, affects all baptized persons, as it used to do in the West before the publication of the Code, which restricted its incidence in canon 1070, §1, to persons baptized in the Catholic Church. The subdiaconate, though regarded as a minor order, is never-

¹ Cf. Cappello, *De Matrimonio*, Appendix I; *Apollinaris*, 1937, p. 457; *Periodica*, 1938, p. 7; *The Jurist*, 1944, p. 200; 1946, p. 39; 1949, p. 17.

theless diriment of marriage (n. 62). Spiritual relationship, in n. 70, arises between the godparent and the baptized person, as with us in canons 768 and 1079. In addition it arises between the godparent and the parents of the baptized person, the com-paternity of our pre-Code law; on the other hand it does not arise, as it does with us, between the minister and the baptized person.

With the very notable exception of affinity, the other relationship impediments are the same as in the West, and to adoption in n. 71 is added "*tutela legalis*" whenever, as in canon 1080, the civil law recognizes this relationship as a diriment impediment. The method of enumerating degrees for all impediments of relationship in the collateral line resembles that of most civil laws: there are as many degrees as there are persons on *both* sides of the line excluding the common stock (n. 66), whereas with us the enumeration is arrived at by counting the persons on *one* side of the line.

Affinity,¹ however, comes as a severe shock to the principle

¹ Can. 67, §1. 1° Affinitas de qua in can. 68, §1, dirimit matrimonium in linea recta, in quolibet gradu; in linea obliqua, usque ad quartum gradum inclusive;

2° Affinitas de qua in can. 68, §2, dirimit matrimonium usque ad quartum gradum inclusive;

3° Affinitas de qua in can. 68, §3, dirimit matrimonium in primo gradu.

§2. Affinitas de qua in can. 68, §1, n. 1, impedimentum multiplicatur:

1° Quoties multiplicatur impedimentum consanguinitatis a quo procedit;

2° Secundo vel ulteriore matrimonio inito cum consanguineo coniugis defuncti.

Can. 68, §1. 1° Affinitas ex digencia oritur ex matrimonio valido etsi non consummato;

2° Viget inter alterutrum coniugem et alterius consanguineos;

3° Qua quis linea et quo gradu, alterutrius coniugis est consanguineus, alterius est affinis.

§2. 1° Iure particulari, affinitas ex digencia de qua in §1, n. 1, oritur etiam inter consanguineos viri et consanguineos mulieris;

2° Ita computatur ut tot sint gradus quot fert summa graduum consanguinitatis quibus uterque affinium distat a coniugibus ex quorum matrimonio affinitas oritur.

§3. 1° Iure particulari, affinitas praeterea oritur ex trigencia seu ex duobus matrimoniis validis, etiam non consummatis, si duae personae matrimonium contrahant: (a) cum una eademque tertia persona, soluto matrimonio, unam post alteram, aut (b) cum duabus personis inter se consanguineis;

2° Affinitatem ex trigencia contrahunt alteruter coniux cum iis qui sunt, ex alio matrimonio, alterius coniugis affines ex digencia;

3° Haec affinitas, inter alterutrum coniugem et alterius affines, ita computatur ut qui sunt ex alio matrimonio affines viri ex digencia, in eodem gradu sint uxoris affines ex trigencia, et vice versa;

4° Quoties haec affinitas viget inter consanguineos quoque unius et affines alterius coniugis, ita computatur ut tot sint gradus quot fert summa graduum cum consanguinitatis tum affinitatis ex digencia quibus uterque affinium distat a coniugibus ex quorum matrimonio affinitas oritur.

of uniformity, and is far from being simple or easily understood. N. 68 is, if one may say so, a perfect maze of several sections and sub-sections, establishing affinity according to local laws of each rite arising "ex digeneia", and also "ex trigeneia" extending between each party in a valid marriage and the relations by affinity of the other party in a previous marriage; extending also to certain blood relations of one party with blood relations of the other.

Similarly, the canonical form required for a valid marriage,¹ since it demands in principle, together with two witnesses, the assistance of the parish priest of the rite to which the parties belong (n. 86, §1, 2), is far more complicated than our own. We cannot discern any clear and certain guidance to meet the case of two parties of Eastern rite dwelling in an exclusively Latin district, unless "Hierarcha" may be taken as "Ordinarius" in n. 86, §3, 3: "Extra territorium proprii ritus, deficiente huius ritus Hierarcha, habendus est tamquam proprius, Hierarcha loci." There is, however, always the remedy of marriage before witnesses alone from n. 89 which is the equivalent of canon 1098.

The rule of canon 1097, §2, that marriage should normally be celebrated before the parish priest of the bride is exactly the

¹ Can. 86, §1. Parochus et loci Hierarcha valide matrimonio assistant:

^{1°} A die tantummodo initae legitime administrationis beneficii, vel initi officii, nisi per sententiam fuerint excommunicati vel interdicti vel suspensi ab officio aut tales declarati;

^{2°} Intra fines dumtaxat sui territorii sive contrahentes sunt subditi, sive non subditi, modo sint sui ritus;

^{3°} Dummodo neque vi neque metu gravi constricti requirant excipiantque contrahentium consensum.

§2. Matrimonio fidelium diversi ritus valide assistit Hierarcha loci et parochus qui ad normam §3, nn. 2-4 est eorum proprius Hierarcha vel parochus.

§3. 1° Nisi aliud statuatur, sive per domicilium sive per quasi-domicilium suum quisque parochum et Hierarcham proprii ritus sortitur;

^{2°} Deficiente parocho pro fidelibus alicuius ritus, horum Hierarcha designet alius ritus parochum, qui eorundem curam suscipiat, postquam idem Hierarcha habuerit consensum Hierarchae parochi designandi;

^{3°} Extra territorium proprii ritus, deficiente huius ritus Hierarcha, habendus est tamquam proprius, Hierarcha loci. Quodsi plures sint, ille habendus est tamquam proprius, quem designaverit Sedes Apostolica vel, obtento eiusdem consensu, Patriarcha, si iure particulari cura fidelium sui ritus extra patriarchatum commorantium ei commissa est.

^{4°} Proprius vagi parochus vel Hierarcha est sui ritus parochus vel Hierarcha loci ubi vagus actu commoratur; deficiente parocho vel Hierarcha sui ritus, serventur normae in nn. 2, 3 statutae;

^{5°} Illorum quoque qui non habent nisi eparchiale domicilium vel quasi-domicilium, parochus proprius est parochus loci in quo actu commorantur.

opposite in n. 88, §3, which requires it to be normally before the parish priest of the bridegroom.

Engagement or "sponsalia", at least in local rites, is far more imposing than in our own law of canon 1017. Its celebration is inscribed in a register (n. 6, §2.2) and may be accompanied by a liturgical blessing, a feature which priests in some parts of France are anxious to introduce into our Western customs.¹

The dispensing of impediments by priests in emergencies (nn. 33-35) follows the broad lines of canons 1043-1045, and, as we shall note in the next section, certain modifications have been introduced for the clearer interpretation of this law. The normal method of obtaining dispensations from higher ecclesiastical authorities, which has always been the rule of East and West, recognizes very considerable powers inherent in the Patriarch (n. 32, §§2 and 3), including the power of granting a *sanatio* for marriages invalid from defect of form or from a diriment impediment from which the Patriarch can dispense (n. 130). The Hierarchs enjoy a more limited power of dispensing (n. 32, §1) but not of granting a *sanatio*. With us the title of Patriarch is, in principle, from canon 271, purely honorific with no special jurisdiction, and our Ordinaries may dispense from impediments, apart from the emergencies recognized by the law, only by delegation from the Holy See. The difference is seen, accordingly, in the wording of certain laws which, as in n. 47, require a delegated authority to mention the indult of a Superior, who may be the Patriarch or the Hierarch, whereas the equivalent canon 1057 requires mention only of the Apostolic See as the superior authority granting delegated jurisdiction.

III

Students of the Code, who have followed the authentic interpretations of canons therein, will observe how these official interpretations have modified those numbers which otherwise merely repeat the wording of the Western canons. It is an indication, no doubt, of what may happen when a new edition of the Code appears.

¹ *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1948, p. 777.

Thus the *Code Commission*, 25 June, 1932, enlarged the definition of a public impediment to include one depending on a public fact;¹ canon 1037 therefore appears in n. 27 as "Publicum censetur impedimentum quod publico ex facto oritur vel quod alio modo probari in foro externo potest; secus est occultum".

In n. 35, §1, the equivalent of canon 1045, §1, the *Code Commission's* reply, 1 March, 1921, is included, and the number reads: ". . . quoties impedimentum detegatur vel quamvis antea cognitum, tunc solum ad notitiam Hierarchae aut parochi deferatur cum iam omnia sunt parata ad nuptias . . ." ²

In the same n. 35, an added §4, which is not in canon 1045, incorporates firstly the decision of 27 July, 1942, that Ordinaries may dispense within the terms of canon 81 even when the terms of canon 1045 are not verified;³ secondly it incorporates the decision of 26 June, 1947, that canon 81 may not be used when recourse to the Papal Legate is possible.⁴ The whole n. 35, §4, reads: "Facultate de qua in §1 non aufertur ab Hierarchis potestas dispensandi a forma in matrimonii celebratione servanda, et ab impedimentis iuris ecclesiastici in quibus Sedes Apostolica solet dispensare, quoties difficilis sit recursus ad Sedem Apostolicam itemque ad Legatum Romani Pontificis necessaria facultate praeditum, et simul in mora sit periculum gravis damni."

The latter part of canon 1099, §2, abrogated⁵ by *Motu Proprio*, 1 August, 1948, is naturally missing from the equivalent n. 90, §2.

In one instance, however, an authentic interpretation of our canons has not been included in the equivalent number of the Eastern marriage code. The Holy Office, 16 January, 1942, decided that the guarantees in mixed marriages did not apply to children already born, though the parties were bound by divine law to educate such children as Catholics.⁶ N. 51 simply repeats canon 1061 without introducing this interpretation of the words "de universa prole".

The only point which resembles any of the new provisions

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1932, IV, p. 510.

² Bouscaren, *Digest*, I, p. 502.

³ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1943, XXIII, p. 89.

⁴ Op. cit., 1948, XXIX, p. 62.

⁵ Op. cit., 1948, XXX, p. 341.

⁶ Op. cit., 1942, XXII, p. 283.

suggested in *Sacrosanctum*, 29 June, 1941, is in n. 88, §2, directing that when so required by local law the parish priest for lawful assistance at a marriage must have the licence of the local Hierarchy, as the Sacred Congregation desires for all marriages in the Western Church in n. 4 (a) of the Instruction. For the rest, canon 1020, which is the basis of the Instruction, is repeated in n. 10 without any extension or amplification.

IV

Of greater interest, perhaps, for students of our Code are certain additions to the wording of laws which resolve existing doubts. It is not suggested that the Eastern codification has any value as an authentic interpretation of our Western canons; the doubts in question continue and are solved by the approved commentators in one sense or another. But, bearing in mind that the Holy See desires the unification of these laws, and has used throughout the Eastern codification the exact terminology of our Code whenever possible, it is of some interest and significance when the wording of the new canons modify the existing ones.

For example, it is in dispute whether the powers of a parish priest in the emergency of canon 1044 are enjoyed by any other priest, such as the assistant priest (*vicarius cooperator*), who enjoys delegated faculties for all marriages in the parish.¹ N. 34, embodying canon 1044, expressly includes him: ". . . *tum parochus, tum vicarius cooperator, tum sacerdos qui matrimonio ad normam can. 89, n. 2, assistit, tum confessorius, sed hic pro foro interno in actu sacramentalis confessionis tantum.*"

It meets our difficulties very nicely in this country to hold that a marriage can be putative, and its offspring therefore legitimate, even when contracted without the canonical form;² the opposite view is more probable, and is incorporated in n. 4, §4, incorporating canon 1015, §4: "*Matrimonium invalidum dicitur putativum, si in bona fide ab una saltem parte celebratum fuerit coram Ecclesia, donec utraque pars de eiusdem nullitate*

¹ Op. cit., 1941, XX, p. 81.
Vol. xxxi

² Op. cit., 1944, XXIV, p. 278.
2A

certa evadat." The words "coram Ecclesia" are added to the wording of canon 1015, §4.

The definition of canonical fear in canon 1087, §1, receives an important modification in n. 78, §1, which reads: "Invalidum quoque est matrimonium initum ob vim vel metum gravem extrinsecus et iniuste incussum ad extorquendum consensum." The last three words are different in our canon and the authors dispute whether "ad extorquendum consensum" is a necessary element in the notion of fear.¹

It would have been most acceptable if other disputed issues could have been settled, at least for the Eastern Church, in this interesting document: the notion of impotence is, for example, in urgent need of precision. The few points noted above show the great care which has been given to its composition, and lead us to hope for a still further group of canons codifying the law of the Eastern Churches on the conduct of marriage causes.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CONFIRMING A DYING HERETIC

The practice of administering *servatis servandis* Penance and Extreme Unction to dying heretics has been sanctioned for some time. May we now add Confirmation in the circumstances permitted by the recent decree, 14 September, 1946? (H.)

REPLY

Canon 786. Aquis baptismi non ablutus valide confirmari nequit; praeterea, ut quis licite et fructuose confirmetur, debet esse in statu gratiae constitutus et, si usu rationis polleat, sufficienter instructus.

¹ Cf. Heylen, *De Matrimonio*, p. 221.

S. Off., 1 November, 1941. Iis autem, qui bona fide errant et iam sensibus sint destituti, ea sacramenta (absolutio et extrema unctio) conferri possunt sub condicione, praesertim si conicere liceat, eos implicate saltem errores reiecisse. (*Periodica*, 1948, p. 97.)

S.C. Sacram., 14 September, 1946, n. 2. Praefati ministri Confirmationem valide et licite conferre valeant per se ipsi, personaliter, fidelibus tantummodo in proprio territorio degentibus. . . .¹

i. The practice as regards Penance and Extreme Unction, long taught by theologians as permissible, was sanctioned by a private reply of the Holy Office, 17 March, 1916, which now appears in *Denzinger*, n. 2181, a. A full explanation of the matter is in *Periodica*, 1929, p. 125 (Vermeersch), and a closer analysis of the condition on which these sacraments are administered is in the same journal, 1948, p. 97 (Umberg), which gives also a more recent private reply of the Holy Office, 1 November, 1941, quoted above. It is not our purpose to discuss this practice in general but, assuming its lawfulness in given circumstances, we have to decide whether it is now to be extended so as to include Confirmation, a point which has only arisen as a practical issue since the decree of 1946 gave the power of confirming to parish priests. Our discussion is limited to the case of an adult heretic, for in contingencies where an infant child of heretical parents is being lawfully baptized in danger of death there can be no doubt that, *servatis servandis*, this infant should also be confirmed.²

ii. Canon Pistoni, an excellent commentator on the decree of 1946, decides that Confirmation cannot validly be conferred on a dying heretic.³ His reason is based on the terms in which the power of confirming is granted to extraordinary ministers in the decree, for it cannot be in dispute that, if it is a case of the ordinary minister, any baptized person may, other things being equal, be validly confirmed. Canon Pistoni's interpretation takes "fidelis" in the decree to mean a baptized person who is neither a heretic, nor a schismatic, nor an apostate, and this is, indeed, its usual meaning both in the Code and in other legal texts. It

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1947, XXVII, p. 57.

² Ecclesiastical Review, April 1947, p. 260.

³ De Confirmatione a Ministro Extraordinario, p. 95.

may also be that he is attaching the word "tantummodo" to the preceding word "fideles".

iii. The Code, however, occasionally uses the word "fidelis" in a wider sense, so as to include every baptized person, in such canons as 218, §2; 1124 and 1126; 1203, §1; 1276; 1384.¹ It must be admitted that the decree empowering parish priests to confirm does obviously have in mind Catholics primarily, if not exclusively, and the truth probably is that the terms of that decree were framed without any reference whatever to the question of administering sacraments to dying heretics conditionally. The common law of canon 731, §2, which forbids the sacraments to heretics in good faith, is similarly expressed with no reference to the practice permitted by the Holy Office in 1916 and 1941, and it is not self-evident from the terms of the 1946 decree on Confirmation that the Holy See expressly excludes heretics from its provisions.

In missionary parts priests have long enjoyed, from the Propaganda faculties, n. 3, the power to confirm, and the conditions attached thereto, unlike most of those attached to the 1946 decree, are not held by the commentators to limit the validity of its administration. It would be helpful in the present query if these commentators discussed the validity and the lawfulness of using the Propaganda faculty in favour of dying heretics in good faith, but we cannot find any who deal with the question.

Our conclusion, given with much hesitation, is that the sacrament would be validly administered, since heretics are not expressly excluded and, on the ordinary principles of sacramental causality, this sacrament can be validly received by any baptized person who has at least an habitual implicit intention, as Canon Pistoni teaches in §22, c., of his Commentary.

iv. Assuming that the sacrament of Confirmation (relying on the 1946 decree) can be validly received *servatis servandis* by a dying heretic, the question remains as to its lawfulness. Canon Pistoni is the only author we have discovered who has given an opinion, which is to declare it to be unlawful, a necessary consequence of the opinion that its reception is invalid.

Our own view is that, even though it may be validly received,

¹ Cf. Mörsdorf, *Die Rechtssprache des Codex*, p. 129.

its reception is unlawful: firstly, because it is not necessary for salvation, and so the grave reasons which justify absolution and Extreme Unction are lacking; secondly, because the administration of Holy Communion is always forbidden in these circumstances, since it is a sign of external communion with the Church and there seems some parity with Confirmation in this respect. One could also cite the direction of the rubric, perhaps, which forbids its administration in the presence of heretics;¹ *a fortiori* it would seem that the rubric forbids the confirmation of heretics.

AFFINITY IN THE DIRECT LINE

Why is the law of canons 1043 and 1044 so strict in excluding a dispensation from affinity in the direct line? Other more serious impediments of closer relationship, e.g. uncle and niece, which are of ecclesiastical law, are not excluded from dispensation in danger of death. (R. E.)

REPLY

Canon 1043. Urgente mortis periculo, locorum Ordinarii . . . possunt . . . super omnibus et singulis impedimentis iuris ecclesiastici . . . exceptis impedimentis provenientibus ex sacro presbyteratus ordine et ex affinitate in linea recta, consummato matrimonio, dispensare. . . .

Canon 1044. In eisdem rerum adiunctis de quibus in can. 1043 et solum pro casibus in quibus nec loci quidem Ordinarius adiri possit, eadem dispensandi facultate pollet . . . parochus. . . .

Canon 1076, §3. Nunquam matrimonium permittatur, si quod subsit dubium num partes sint consanguineae in aliquo gradu lineae rectae. . . .

i. The church cannot dispense from impediments which are of natural or divine law (e.g. impotence or the bond of a previous marriage). On the fringes of both classes instances may occur which are doubtfully to be included, because it is in dispute whether they are of divine law or not. It will be remem-

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1947, XXVIII, p. 41.

bered that the validity of a papal dispensation permitting Henry VIII to marry his deceased brother's wife was contested at the time by regal theologians, though the affinity was only in the collateral line. It is now agreed that affinity even in the direct line (e.g. the relationship between stepfather and stepdaughter) is not of divine law, and canon 1043, which codifies a papal document dated 20 February, 1888,¹ supports this view. But in the fairly recent past it was not agreed, and the reason usually given for the Church declining to dispense the impediment was the possibility that it might be of divine law.² This reason must now be abandoned.

ii. If, however, the marriage which creates affinity has been consummated, the possibility of infringing divine law in dispensing it may arise from another cause: the relationship may possibly be consanguinity. The Code in canon 97, §1, has changed the pivot of affinity from *copula* to *matrimonium validum*, and what we now call affinity in the direct line arising from a consummated valid marriage is the exact equivalent of the pre-Code affinity arising from lawful copula. The *Code Commission*, 2 June, 1918, decided that if unlawful copula preceding marriage causes doubt whether a relationship is consanguinity or affinity, the impediment cannot be dispensed since this is barred by canon 1076, §3. In pre-Code law, affinity in the direct line arising from unlawful copula was occasionally dispensed, provided it was established that the copula was subsequent to the birth of the person desiring to marry a step-parent.³ Similarly under the Code any possible infringement of divine law arising from suspected consanguinity under the appearance of affinity is met by canon 1076, §3. Therefore it would seem that this particular point must also be abandoned in establishing the ultimate reason for the law of canon 1043, which denies the power of the Ordinary and others to dispense affinity in the direct line arising from a consummated marriage, though many writers give this reason as the explanation.⁴

iii. It may well be that the outlook described in (i) and (ii) has influenced the unwillingness of the Church to dispense

¹ *Fontes*, n. 1109.

² Zitelli, *De Dispensationibus Matrimonialibus* (1887), p. 55.

³ Oesterle, *Consultationes de Iure Matrimonio*, p. 119.

⁴ *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 1925, p. 57.

affinity in the direct line once the marriage which causes it has been consummated. But if these influences are put aside, the ultimate reasons for this attitude can only be the social and moral ones which apply equally to consanguinity in the collateral line; except for the possibility of defective offspring they are the same in both impediments. Affinity even in the direct line, however, being of ecclesiastical not divine law, dispensations are possible though extremely rare, and examples are quoted occurring both before and after the Code.¹ They are so rare that we regard it as a principle that the Church can but does not dispense, exactly as for the priesthood, and therefore excludes the dispensing power from the faculties of Ordinaries and others even in danger of death. A petition for a dispensation may be sent to the Holy See, and meanwhile, provided the person is prepared to accept the decision, the last sacraments may be administered.

SUPERVENING "DISPARITAS CULTUS"

An unbaptized woman, validly married to an unbaptized man, is about to become a Catholic. There is no question of invoking the Pauline Privilege since she is happily married and wishes so to remain. But the husband will not consent to the baptism and Catholic education either of their two infant children or of any other children who may be born. May this woman, nevertheless, become a Catholic? If so, is a dispensation required from the impediment of difference of worship? (W.)

REPLY

S. Off., 14 December, 1848; *Fontes*, n. 908 : 1. An (in casu matrimonii in infidelitate contracta, et conversionis unius coniugis) si non daretur talis dispensatio (disparitatis cultus), pars conversa non posset nec licite nec valide remanere cum sua parte infideli, sine contumelia Creatoris cohabitare consentiente?

2. Quid si pars infidelis, equidem sine contumelia Creatoris

¹ De Smet, *De Matrimonio*, §622; Chrétien, §178.

cohabitare consentiret, sed recusaret sincere ut proles nata vel nascitura in religione instituatur?

Resp. Ad 1. Quando pars infidelis consentit habitare cum fidei absque contumelia Creatoris matrimonium consistere iuxta D. Paulum, atque ad huiusmodi effectum nullam in casu necessariam esse dispensationem. Ad 2. Posse in casu partem fidelem transire ad alias nuptias cum alia parte catholica; recusatio enim educationis prolis in religione catholica aequivalet contumeliae Creatoris. R.P.D. autem Vicarius Ap. efficaciter insinuet parti fidei ut curet, eo meliori modo quo potest, pertrahere prolem, si quam habuit, ad catholicam religionem.

i. Difference of worship supervening is not, canonically speaking, a diriment impediment, for the marriage contracted in infidelity is valid and it remains valid after the baptism of one party, though not a sacrament. The practice of seeking, in a case of this kind, a dispensation from difference of worship, and of renewing marriage consent after obtaining it, is rightly described by Payen as unnecessary, useless and of no value whatever.¹ The woman, a candidate for baptism, must keep quite distinct two different questions: the first is her grave obligation to receive baptism in the Catholic Church, the second is concerned with her rights and obligations after becoming a Catholic. But, since her awareness of these rights and obligations may influence her decision to be baptized, she should be informed about them beforehand.

ii. It is certain that the refusal of the unbaptized party to allow any future children to be baptized and educated in the Catholic faith comes within the notion of "departure" of which St Paul speaks in 1 Cor. vii, 15, and is so interpreted by the Holy Office. From an analogy with the reply of the *Code Commission*, 16 January, 1942,² which denied that the guarantees of canon 1061 applied to children already born, it seems to us likely that the refusal of the unbaptized party to permit their baptism is not, by itself, to be considered "departure". His refusal with regard to future children certainly is, and the baptized party is therefore entitled, with the appropriate canonical procedure, to use the Pauline Privilege.

iii. In this REVIEW, 1947, XXVII, p. 266, the question was

¹ *De Matrimonio*, §2226.

² THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, p. 283.

discussed whether the baptized party, assuming that the unbaptized had given all the canonical assurances, was bound to continue cohabitation, and the solution was that a decision rested with the Ordinary of the convert. The same must be said of the exactly opposite situation, as in the present case, where the baptized party desires to cohabit with the unbaptized, even though this is accompanied by danger to the offspring. The Holy Office, 18 June, 1856,¹ directed: "... neque coniux ad fidem conversus cogendus est ut infidelem coniugem pacifice ac sine contumelia Creatoris cohabitare volentem deserat, nisi revera adsit perversionis periculum sive respective coniugis fidelis, sive prolis".

Without in any way prejudging what the Ordinary's decision will be, it is clear that all the circumstances in a situation of this kind call for an indulgent decision in accordance with the desire of the baptized party to continue cohabitation. For one thing, whatever the theory or principle may be which might establish a duty to cease cohabitation, the difficulties are so imposing, having regard to the civil law as well as to the wishes of the prospective convert, that one may rightly see in them moral impossibility. It is rather analogous to the far more serious situation where entering upon marriage, and not merely its continuance, must be tolerated, even though accompanied by the prospect of the offspring being brought up in infidelity.²

We think, therefore, in a case of this kind, that it suffices for the prospective convert to be aware of her obligation regarding the faith of her children, and to undertake to fulfil it, as the Holy Office states, "eo meliori modo quo potest". She must do what in her lies to secure the baptism and Catholic education of all the children after her own conversion to the Catholic faith; but the decision is with the Ordinary, who should be informed of these circumstances when the Convert Form is forwarded to him.

PROBLEMS IN NON-CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

1. May Catholic girl students of a non-Catholic training college attend lectures on Scripture given by a non-Catholic

¹ *Fontes*, n. 936.

² Cf. *S. Off.*, 28 April, 1938; *Sylloge*, n. 206 bis; *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1938, XV, p. 548; 1948, XXIX, p. 104.

professor, when these lectures take the form of a discussion where everybody may put forward her views? Some Catholic students see here an excellent opportunity of expounding Catholic doctrine.

2. May Catholic teachers in non-Catholic schools give the official Scripture Course for non-Catholics, if they are allowed to expound but not impose the true Catholic doctrine? If so, are they obliged to explain the integral Catholic view? (F.)

REPLY

ad i. The question is one for the Ordinary to decide, since many points of public policy converge, e.g. the presence of Catholic students in a non-Catholic training college; or the competence of these students to intervene publicly in a religious disputation; and, if they are competent, the question arises whether their intervention is necessary and likely to forward the cause of Catholic truth.

Accordingly, an answer in this journal cannot do more than give an opinion whether a request for permissions of this kind is likely to be successful. We think it is unlikely since the practice is forbidden by canon 1325, §3: "Caveant Catholici ne disputationes vel collationes, publicas praesertim, cum acatholicis habeant, sine venia Sanctae Sedis aut, si casus urgeat, loci Ordinarii." The Ordinary may permit the practice if there is some urgent necessity, but normally a decision rests with the Holy See. In addition, as it seems to us, Catholics still *in statu pupillari* would be no match for a non-Catholic Scripture professor, even if in principle disputation is considered lawful.

ad 2. Recourse to the Ordinary is advisable, since the presence of non-Catholic teachers might encourage some Catholics to send their children to the school against the law of canon 1374. But the necessity of this recourse is not so clear as in the previous question, for in many countries, as in the United States, Catholic teachers, in order to earn a living, have to take posts in non-Catholic schools, and teach the subjects set, amongst which may be Holy Scripture. *The Ecclesiastical Review*, July 1945, contains a good exposition by Fr O'Connell, C.S.S.R., of

the various problems then likely to arise. The use of a non-Catholic Bible is permitted by some American authorities, but the writer is of the opinion, which we think correct, that the teacher should bring a Catholic version if the work of teaching involves reading the Bible to the children; alternatively permission might be obtained from the Ordinary for the use of a non-Catholic version.

It suffices for the teacher to expound the true doctrine, which would normally mean imposing it, since in a school the children normally accept what the teacher says. In the unlikely event of some child observing that the teacher has got the thing all wrong, it would suffice to answer that the wrong doctrine is held by Protestants and their errors have to be tolerated.

The teacher is not bound to teach the integral Catholic view, provided that what is taught is true, unless a child expressly asks; and in this case, as Fr O'Connell rightly says, it would often be prudent, for avoiding a charge of proselytizing, to tell the child to consult a Catholic outside school hours.

As is evident, the situation is difficult and requires quite a high standard of casuistical skill in steering a safe course. One thing is absolutely certain: the teacher may never, for any reason whatever, teach error and heresy.

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

EASTERN CHURCH MARRIAGE LAWS¹

MOTU PROPRIO

DE DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTI MATRIMONII PRO ECCLESIA ORIENTALI
(*A.A.S.*, 1949, XLI, p. 89).

PIUS PP. XII

Crebrae allatae sunt Nobis, praesertim postremis hisce annis, tum a Legatis Nostreis tum a sacrorum Antistitibus Orientalis Ecclesiae

¹ For a commentary on this document and the canons mentioned, see above, pp. 331-338.

supplicationes, per quas rogabamur, ut, instantibus votis annuentes, dum codificatio legum Ecclesiae Orientalis haud multum abest, ut absolvatur, earundem legum singularia quaedam capita, magni quidem momenti, nulla interposita mora promulgaremus, ut gravibus et perniciosis rerum adiunctis, in quibus nonnullae Christi ovilis partes orientali ritu utentes versarentur, efficaci praesidio obviam iremus.

Nos igitur, attente et cogitate omnibus in Domino perpensis, motu proprio, certa scientia ac de Apostolicae plenitudine potestatis statuimus ac decrevimus eos canones iam nunc publicare, qui ad sacramenti matrimonii disciplinam spectant.

Iam initio, cum ad Codicem conficiendum prima conferrentur studia, Petrus S. R. E. Presbyter Cardinalis Gasparri, Consilii Praeses Codici canonico Orientalis Ecclesiae praeparando, ob oculos habitis facilitate et frequentia necessitudinum, quas orbis terrarum populi et nationes ob nostrae aetatis expeditissimum commeatum inter se nectunt, litteris die xv mensis Septembris anno MCMXXX datis, sacros Orientalis Ecclesiae Pastores consulebat, ab iisdem petens an in expletionem optatorum multis e locis Apostolicae Sedi explicatorum expedire videretur, ut, quoad fieri posset, ecclesiastica disciplina ad matrimonialia impedimenta et ad formam ineundi nuptialis foederis pertinens unius tenoris redderetur; idque poscebatur, quia ob memoratam eundi et remeandi facilitatem crebriores habebantur inter homines mixti ritus nuptiae necnon eo proposito, ut incertitudines de matrimoniorum validitate, eorum sanctitati nocentes, penitus auferrentur.

Consilium igitur Orientalis Ecclesiae Codici canonico conficiendo, debita attentione libratis responsis, ferme cunctis asseverantibus, eorundem sacrorum Pastorum, postquam haec fel. mem. Summo Pontifici proximo Decessori Nostro retulit, adprobationi Nostrae hos canones proposuit, quos Nos Apostolica auctoritate Nostra comprobamus:

(Canons omitted.)

Nos autem per Apostolicas has Litteras motu proprio datas supra recensitos canones promulgamus eisdemque vim legis christifidelibus Ecclesiae Orientalis tribuimus, ubique terrarum hi sunt et tametsi Praelato diversi ritus sunt subiecti. Simulac per Apostolicas has Litteras huiusmodi canones vigere coeperint, sua destituentur vi quodlibet statutum, sive generale sive particulare vel speciale, etiam latum a Synodis speciali forma adprobatis, quaelibet praescriptio et consuetudo adhuc vigens, sive generalis, sive particularis ita ut disci-

plina sacramenti matrimonii unice iisdem canonibus regatur, neque amplius ius particulare iis contrarium vigorem habeat nisi quando et quantum in iis admittatur.

Ut autem huius Nostrae voluntatis notitia tempestive ad omnes, quorum res interest, perveniat, volumus et constituimus, ut Apostolicae hae Litterae motu proprio data a die secundo mensis Maii an. MCMXXXIX, festo S. Athanasii, Pontificis et Doctoris, executionem suscipere incipiant, quibuslibet contrariis non obstantibus, etiam peculiarissima mentione dignis.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XXII mensis Februarii, in festo Cathedrae S. Petri in Antiochia, anno MCMXXXIX, Pontificatus Nostri decimo.

PIUS PP. XII

(Documents omitted.)

THE CASE OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

CONSISTORIUM SECRETUM

(A.A.S., 1949, XLI, p. 41.)

Feria secunda, die XIV mensis Februarii anno MCMXLIX, in Palatio Apostolico Vaticano habitum est *Consistorium secretum*, in quo haec fuit

ALLOCUTIO SSMI DOMINI NOSTRI

VENERABILES FRATRES

In hoc sacrum extra ordinem Consistorium hodierna die vos convocavimus, ut animum Nostrum acerrimo maerore oppletum vobis aperiremus. Cuius quidem maeroris causam putamus facile patere vobis: agitur nempe de gravissimo facinore, quod non modo amplissimum Collegium vestrum, non modo Ecclesiam universam, sed quotquot etiam sunt humanae dignitatis humanaeque libertatis assertores miserandum in modum offendit. Quamobrem, vixdum novimus Dilectum Filium Nostrum Iosephum S. R. E. Card. Mindszenty, Archiepiscopum Strigoniensem, debita augustae religioni reverentia posthabita, temerarie fuisse in carcerem coniectum, datis ad Venerabiles Fratres Hungariae Archiepiscopos et Episcopos amantissimis

litteris, illatam Ecclesiae iniuriam, ut officii conscientia imperabat Nobis, publice sollemniterque expostulavimus.

Hodie vero dum res eo usque deducta est, ut ad extremum dignissimi huius Praesulis dedecus devenerit, qui quidem ut reprobos in ergastulum datus est, facere non possumus quin sollemnem eiusmodi expostulationem vobis coram iteremus. Ad id Nos movent imprimis sacra religionis iura, quibus adserendis vindicandisque strenuus hic sacrorum Antistes impavido fortique pectore diuturnam dedit operam; ac praeterea unanimes etiam liberarum gentium liberorumque populorum consensus, qui verbis scriptisque, ab iis quoque editis, qui publica auctoritate fruuntur, ac vel ab iis, qui catholicam non amplectuntur fidem, latissime in luce solis patuit.

At non in plena luce solis, ut nostis, huius Praesulis causa peracta fuit, de avita religione de christianisque redintegrandis moribus optime meriti. Notitiae siquidem perlatae sunt, quae initio animos anxietate quadam affecere; qui enim ex exteris Nationibus petiere ut in Hungariam se conferrent, ubi praesentes huius actionis cursum cernere possent, si quovis modo videbantur rem serena mente fore iudicaturi sincereque renuntiaturi, talem tulerunt repulsam, quae in eos non solum, sed in ceteros etiam cordatos rectosque viros opinionem induceret causam Budapestini pertractari, quam qui agerent, timere viderentur ne palam aperteque ab omnibus dignosceretur. At iustitia, quae reapse hoc nomine dignanda sit, non a praeiudicatis opinationibus proficiscitur, non praestituta iam sententia nititur, sed liberam sponte exopat disceptationem, ac debitam unicuique cogitandi, credendi loquendique facultatem tribuit.

At quamvis res nec tuto cognitae, neque aperto plenoque modo renuntiatae fuerint, putamus tamen mentionem de iudicio praetermittere non posse, quod omnes civili cultu ornati homines hac super causa dedere: praesertim de nimis rapido actionis cursu, qui facile in animos suspicionem induxit; de accusationibus captioso artificio instructis, ac de physica huius Antistitis condicione, quae quidem sine arcanis impulsionebus, quas non fas est declarare, intellegi non potest; quandoquidem vir strenua adhuc fortitudine ex natura suae vitae actione pollens, tam debilis ac mente vacillans improvise apparuit, ut eius agendi ratio accusationem non in semetipsum, sed adversus eius accusatores condemnatoresque statuere videretur.

Hisce autem in rebus omnibus hoc unum praeclare patet: in id nempe potissimum iudiciale actionem contendisse ut Catholica Ecclesia in Hungaria perturbaretur, ea nimirum ratione, de qua Sacra Scriptura loquitur: "Percutiam pastorem, et dispergentur oves gregis".¹

¹ Matth. xxvi, 31.

Dum igitur Nos hoc tristissimum eventum dolentes reprobamus ac publicae opinionis ipsiusque historiae tribunali quasi diiudicandum committimus, rem facimus, quam et violata Ecclesiae iura et ipsa humanae personae dignitas omnino postulant.

Ac peculiari modo hoc etiam declarandum putamus, esse nempe omnino a veritate alienum quod in huius actionis decursu asseveratum fuit: hoc est universam causam, de qua actum est, ex eo pendere quod Apostolica haec Sedes, ob politicae in populos dominationis consilia ac nisus, iussa ac mandata ediderit Hungarorum Reipublicae eiusque moderatoribus adversandi; atque adeo rem omnem in eandem recidere Apostolicam Sedem.

Norunt enim omnes Catholicam Ecclesiam non terrenis rationibus duci, sed quamlibet admittere Civitatis gubernandae formam, dummodo divinis humanisque iuribus non repugnet. Quodsi repugnet, sacrorum Antistites ac christifideles omnes ex sua ipsorum officii conscientia debent iniustis legibus obsistere.

In hisce autem, Venerabiles Fratres, rerum angustiis non defuere Nobis a misericordiarum Patre¹ superna solacia, quae dolorem mitigarent Nostrum. Ea imprimis ex tenaci catholicorum Hungarorum fide profiscuntur, qui quidem, etsi in impeditissimis rebus constituti, quidquid possunt efficiunt, ut avitam religionem tueantur, ac priscos decessorum suorum fastos renouent; itemque ex ea firmissima fiducia, quam paterno fovemus animo, fore ut Hungariae Episcopi plena semper concordia sollertique opera enitantur Ecclesiae libertatem defendere, christifidelium unitatem omni ope confirmare, eosdemque in eam spem erigere, quae cum e Caelo oriatur ac divina alatur gratia, nec miseris, nec iniustis huius vitae casibus restingui, vel debilitari potest.

Atque eiusmodi superna solacia ex vobis etiam, Venerabiles Fratres, obvenerunt Nobis; vos enim vidimus, Nobis in hoc rerum discrimine devinctissimos, Nostrum participare maerorem ac Nostris vestras coniungere preces; parique modo ex ceteris quoque totius terrarum orbis Patribus Cardinalibus, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, qui una cum clero et populo cuiusque suo flagrantissimas ad Nos dederunt litteras, vel telegraphicis nuntios, quibus et iniuriae notam Ecclesiae inustam conquerendo reprobarunt, et admovendas Deo privatim, publice supplicationes polliciti sunt.

Id ut omnes facere ne desistant vehementer optamus; quotiescumque enim catholica res tam gravibus iactatur tempestatibus, ut eas humana facultas evincere ac superare nequeat, ad Divinum est Redemptorem fidentibus animis confugiendum, qui unus potest

¹ Cfr. 2 Cor. i, 3.

tumescentes sedare fluctus, ac tranquillam reducere serenitatem. Potentissimo igitur interposito Deiparae Virginis patrocinio, a Deo omnes precando contendamus, ut qui insectationes carceres vexationesque patiantur, necessario divinae gratiae rore christianaeque virtutis robore confirmentur; qui vero Ecclesiae libertatem humanaeque conscientiae iura conculcare temerario ausu enitantur, tandem aliquando intellegant civilem quamlibet consortionem, sublata religione ac quasi in exilium exacto Numine, consistere numquam posse. Augusta enim solummodo religio potest civium officia ac iura iusta ratione temperare, rei publicae solidare fundamenta, atque hominum mores salutaris normis conformare et ad rectum ordinem virtutemque dirigere. Quod summus Romanorum orator asseverabat: "Vos, Pontifices, . . . diligentius urbem religione, quam ipsis moenibus cingitis",¹ id, cum de christianis praeceptis christianaeque fide agitur, tam verum certumque est, quam quod maxime. Hoc igitur agnoscant omnes, qui publicae rei gubernacula moderantur; atque adeo debita ubique restituatur Ecclesiae libertas, ita quidem ut eadem, nullis praepedita repagulis, salutari sua doctrina queat hominum mentes collustrare, iuventutem recte instituere et ad virtutem educere, domesticos consecrare convictus, omnemque permeare hominum vitam. Qua profecto ex actione civilis societas nullum umquam detrimentum patietur, sed summam assequetur utilitatem. Tum enim reapse, Venerabiles Fratres, socialibus mutuisque rationibus iustitia aequitateque compositis; elatis, ut oportet, indigentium condicionibus atque ad humanam dignitatem restitutis; sedatis denique tandem discordiis tranquillisque fraterna caritate animis, meliora tempora—quod vehementer optamus, ac supplici poscimus prece—cunctis populis ac gentibus feliciter orientur.

Haec habebamus, Venerabiles Fratres, quae vobiscum hoc in amplissimo consensu communicaremus; vobiscum dicimus, qui Nobis tam prope in universa gubernanda Ecclesia assidetis, sedulam prudentiam sollertemque impertientes operam vestram.

¹ Cic., *De Nat. Deor.*, III, 40.

BOOK REVIEWS

Mariologie de Saint Bernard. By Dom Dominique Nogues. Pp. 236.
(Casterman, Tournai, 1947.)

THOUGH dated 1947, this book appears to be a reprint of the book of the same title published in 1935.

A book on the Mariology of St Bernard cannot fail to interest. The simplicity, beauty and sweet reasonableness of his sermons on Our Lady are far more effective than the pages of flowery encomiums so common among the later Eastern Fathers. But we go to St Bernard rather for preaching, poetry and song than for systematic theology. Consequently we are not surprised to find no speculation and little dogma in the book, though undoubtedly much theology is implied in Bernard's praises of Mary's humility, so much more glorious than even her virginity, and in his unfolding of the meaning of her divine and human Motherhood.

It was a happy thought of Dom Dominique Nogues, the Abbot General of the Cistercians of the Strict Observance, to give us the results of his long years of contemplation on the Mother of God, under the guidance and inspiration of his beloved patron, St Bernard. In this small book you will find the genuine Bernard, and learn something of the secret of his *pietas*. Dom Dominique has truly caught the spirit of his Father in religion.

St Bernard's method is one which must appeal to us Westerns. He keeps closely to the text of Scripture, repeating its words again and again, until their full meaning becomes clear. There is nothing which startles, no product of pure imagination, nothing but pure doctrine; exceptional only is the wealth of illustration from accommodated texts of the Old Testament. Bernard is not interested in the apocryphal stories of miracles and wonders; he is concerned only with Mary's spiritual graces and glories. The sureness of his devotion is reflected in the *Memorare*, and other antiphons and songs that have been taken from his works, as well as in the Marian piety which has characterized his followers.

It is when St Bernard enters more nearly into the field of pure theology that posterity has sometimes been doubtful how to interpret him. Like so many of Bernard's devotees, Dom Dominique Nogues jealously defends him against the charge of having theologically opposed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. He admits that Bernard opposed the feast, and is able to show that he had good reasons for so doing. But I must confess that the reading of St Bernard's famous letter to the Canons of Lyons leaves me with the

same impression that it gave so many of his contemporaries. I cannot help feeling that St Bernard confines Our Lady's privileges over other saints to (a) sanctification in the womb, a privilege she had in common with St John the Baptist; (b) fuller graces, without precise definition; and (c) sinlessness after sanctification. He may have meant more than that, but mediaeval writers like Nicholas of St Albans did not think so. On the contrary, they felt that St Bernard had theological reasons against the feast, as well as disciplinary ones.

I am sorry that Dom Dominique's zeal for St Bernard has led him to do less than justice to one of our English defenders of Mary's privilege, the Nicholas just mentioned. He bases his whole attack on a supposed identity between him and a certain renegade secretary of St Bernard, Nicholas of Clairvaux. Mabillon in the seventeenth century made it clear to scholars that these two could not be identified. One was an Englishman, the other French. One was rough and uncouth, the other a polished humanist. One had never been seen by Peter of Celles, the other had at a much earlier date been an intimate friend. Readers may remember my account of an unpublished manuscript of Nicholas of St Albans in *THE CLERGY REVIEW* of last August. This manuscript makes it doubly clear that our Nicholas, the ardent lover of Mary, could not be identified with the rebel ex-secretary, whom Bernard compares with Judas. There still remains some doubt about St Bernard's real views on the Immaculate Conception, but there is none about those of Nicholas of St Albans.

We must however forgive this blemish in a devotional work on Bernard's Mariology, which is worthy of its subject. Its purpose is to make us love Our Lady as St Bernard did, and to pay due homage to her chivalrous disciple. But it was not destined to be a contribution to speculative theology.

H. FRANCIS DAVIS

The Human Wisdom of St Thomas. Arranged by Josef Pieper. Translated by Drostan MacLaren, O.P. Pp. xiii + 111. (Sheed & Ward. 6s.)

THIS is a selection of texts from the various writings of St Thomas, giving a conspectus of his philosophical system. Strictly theological texts have been excluded; but, as the author states in his thoughtful preface, the philosophy of St Thomas was rooted in his theology and, while fully systematic in itself, pointed beyond itself to the Faith and to theology. Hence order and mystery are characteristics of Thomism. The order is obvious in the architectural beauty and completeness of St Thomas's greatest works. The mystery is obvious too, not only because of the great truths of the Faith which lie behind the philosophy

but also in the philosophy itself, for to the mind of St Thomas all knowledge even of this world is steeped in mystery, so that, to quote him, "the effort of human thought has not been able to track down the essence of a single gnat".

The selection of texts has been made according to the personal feelings of the author. Other selectors might have made a somewhat different choice out of the rich storehouse of St Thomas. But let it be said that this selection serves adequately to give a general view of the Saint's philosophy. The author compiled it while he was serving with the forces; he remarks how in these strange surroundings the old familiar truths came home to him with new point and meaning. He groups the thoughts in seventeen sections, the first quotation in each serving as a pointer to that section. Here certainly are

Jewels five-words-long
That on the stretch'd forefinger of all time
Sparkle for ever.

It was wise of the compiler to offer no commentary with the texts. St Thomas speaks for himself; and the student, pondering slowly, as he must, and a little at a time, the wealth of thought in every pithy sentence, and beginning gradually to discern the beauty of the ordered whole, will come to accept the truth of the introductory text: "The least insight that one can obtain into sublime things is more desirable than the most certain knowledge of lower things." J. C.

Rich and Poor in Christian Tradition. Writings of many centuries chosen, translated and introduced by Walter Shewring. Pp. x + 262. (Burns Oates. 10s. 6d.)

IN this very interesting and valuable book Mr Shewring sets out to establish from authentic Christian tradition what are the principles the Church accepts with regard to riches and poverty. To do this with reasonable fullness he assembles selected passages from the writings of Popes, Bishops, Saints, Doctors and Theologians from the fourth century to the present day. He introduces in all twenty-five authorities: among them St John Chrysostom, the three Cappadocian Fathers, St Augustine, St Leo the Great, St Gregory the Great, St Bernard, St Thomas, the mediaeval mystical writers, Francisco de Vitoria, the great French orators of the seventeenth century, and the three "social" Popes of modern times, Leo XIII, Pius XI and Pius XII. The diverse nature of the citations, due to the different characters and purposes of the writers, increases the interest and attractiveness of the book; you have fiery eloquence and calm, measured

thinking; the colourful and the austere classical; poetry and plain prose. All the translations are Mr Shewring's own, and all are excellently done. To complete his treatment the author has added an introductory chapter, outlining the Biblical teaching on the subject and the patristic evidence in the first three centuries, and setting out at some length the principles of Catholic sociology, gathered for the most part from the representative authorities quoted.

This is, then, a book on social questions different from the general run of treatises, large and small, which usually adorn the shelves of the serious student of the subject. A frontispiece reproduces the sculpture by Eric Gill of St Martin of Tours at Campion Hall, Oxford.

J. C.

American Humanism and the New Age. By Louis J. A. Mercier. Pp. 218. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. \$4.)

THOSE who are acquainted with Dr Louis Mercier's earlier works, one of which has been crowned by the French Academy, will know that the author possesses a wide and discriminating knowledge of European literature. In his latest volume, he discusses humanism as a challenge to the naturalism advocated by John Dewey, whose influence in American intellectual circles is by no means on the decline. There are some illuminating chapters on such thinkers as Paul Elmer More, Norman Foerster, Lynn Harold Hough; and the interesting suggestion is made that the late Irving Babbitt, a gifted man of letters, in some respects did in America what Paul Claudel, among others, has done in France. It is possible that the admirers of *Le soulier de satin* will regard this observation as a minor heresy.

What is stressed in these pages is the fact that secularist literature, whether it be the dramas of a Racine or the sparkling comedies of a Molière, offers a somewhat mixed legacy. In the classics, evil is often presented in an attractive guise, and, as Pascal once remarked, unless a man has the support of the supernatural, he will fall either into a stoic pride or an epicurean relaxation. Hence the need of a supernaturalized humanism—it is the author's phrase—which will utilize the wisdom of the ages, as enshrined in literature, and at the same time cultivate a spirit of prayer along with a healthy self-discipline. On this firm basis, Dr Mercier builds up his weighty arguments which, if not strikingly original, have the merits of clarity and deep sincerity. Christian humanism, a lovely flower, must not be crushed in the new atomic age.

This volume is intended mainly for American readers, but it can be consulted with profit by Catholic students of literature everywhere.

OSWALD J. MURPHY

Institutiones Iuris Canonici. Auctore Matthaeo a Coronata, O.M.C.
Vol. I, *Normae Generales, De Personis*; Vol. III, *De Processibus*; Vol.
IV, *De Delictis et Poenis*; Vol. V, *Index et Appendices*. Pp. 1074, 721,
701, 333. *Ius Publicum Ecclesiasticum*. Pp. 327. (Marietti.)

NEEDLESS to say, none of the above works is newly published; they are the current editions of a manual widely used by students of canon law, and though fuller in certain respects than the commentaries of some other canonists, one would not expect to find in them a detailed treatment of every difficulty and obscurity.

The author's method is to print the text of the Code and of other important documents, adding thereto his own commentary and indicating the chief controversies which have arisen in their interpretation. In this respect he does not vastly differ from other commentators. But his index volume (Vol. V) is superior to any other we have seen, containing in addition to an alphabetical index the full text of the more weighty Roman documents that have appeared since the promulgation of the Code, such as the *Normae* governing Rotal procedure. Amongst these documents are some *pagellae* of faculties, taken from various periodicals in which they first appeared, or gathered from private sources. These are difficult to come by and are of notable value for a practical understanding of how the law is applied, e.g. the faculties granted by the Sacred Penitentiary to certain confessors. The volume also contains a vast bibliography of eighty pages which would be more useful, perhaps, if arranged under subject headings and not alphabetically.

Working, as we know, under the gravest difficulties caused by illness and the war, the learned author has courageously surmounted them, and has put all students of the subject in his debt by keeping these manuals well up to date.

The Way into the Kingdom. By Vera Barclay. Pp. 79. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 3s.)

MANY eldering readers will recall Miss Barclay's book when it first appeared in 1922, and will delight in re-reading pages which retain their freshness after the lapse of more than a quarter of a century. The writer (she was largely instrumental in starting the Wolf-cubs) found her true vocation in the care of small children, whose souls expanded under her sympathetic influence, and from whom she learned to look at life with almost the clear vision of a child. What she has set down in this series of papers—written originally for *The Sower*—is of rare value to anyone who teaches children. She succeeds in penetrating the mind of the child, and in bringing her own

thoughts into tune with those of even the youngest. There has never appeared a clearer demonstration of the sublimity of the teacher's task, which, for Miss Barclay, as for all Catholic teachers, is nothing less than a special grace from God.

Almost a third part of the book is taken up with an Introduction by Father Drinkwater, editor of *The Sower*; and it is not an easy matter to speak in sufficiently high terms of what he writes. In setting forth the meaning of words such as "teacher", "lesson" and "temptation", he proves himself a master of his subject. Teachers will be grateful for his perfect grasp of the difficulties they encounter, and for his invaluable advice upon methods in the class-room. Young people in training to be teachers will see their way clearly by what is reflected from this small book—their way into the kingdom of young minds, where so many well-intentioned seekers have failed to enter because they have failed to understand.

SOME BOOKS FOR CHILDREN

Little Green Truck. By Jane Henderson. Pp. 247. (John Miles. 8s. 6d.)

THIS story is delightful throughout; it is woven round the missionary life of "Father Bon" (for Bonaventure) among the whites and the not-so-whites of his settlement parish. The book reads so well that it is difficult to decide whether it was written for senior children or their elders; perhaps these are all of one category in the mind of Miss Henderson. She tells her story as to the manner born. In Father Bon she has created a genuine character of fiction who becomes so real a person that it is a relief to find him very much alive at the end of the book. We hope to meet him again; the sooner the better.

Christopher's Talks to the Little Ones. By David L. Greenstock. Pp. viii + 160. (Burns Oates. 6s.)

Heaven on Thursday. By M. K. Richardson. Pp. viii + 157. (Burns Oates. 7s. 6d.)

THREE years ago, when he published two books of talks to Catholic children in general, the fate of Christopher was sealed; it at once became inevitable that he should produce more of what was considered on all sides as being so very good. As the title shows, his new work is for quite young children; and as his Introduction to the book plainly indicates, he supposes that the talks (of which he gives the full substance) will come from parents rather than from teachers in

school. The author ranges far and wide in the field of the Faith, but never too far for the youngest child to follow.

Heaven on Thursday is for senior children. It is not a series of talks, but chapters of a tale; and the tale closes on Ascension Day 1865 when God called home His faithful servant Sophie Barat, who had prophesied her own death: hence the book's title. This is the story of one of the great French Foundresses whose work has meant so much to so many Catholic—and non-Catholic—women who have been educated by her nuns, Sisters of the Sacred Heart. The old girls of her schools, as well as present-day pupils, will relish in a particular manner the retold history of her wonderful life; and all readers will be grateful to the biographer for this lively account of the eighty-five years of life during which Mother Barat grew in sanctity as she raised the fine edifice of her Institute, raising the while all unwittingly an everlasting monument to her own greatness.

Gospel Rhymes. By various authors. Pp. 60. (Sheed & Ward. 8s. 6d.)

A CHILD's book of poems, every poem being a Gospel story told in rhyme, and told in a manner to attract and focus attention by verses that are easy-flowing, witty and lively with interest. As good hymns almost sing before they are set to music, good poems—such as these—almost memorize themselves. Little boys and girls will take so readily to these stories in verse that they will need no urging to learn them by heart. The collection is ideal for school entertainments, for which reason alone it will bring a shower of teachers' blessings upon the heads of its group of well-known authors.

The Saints and Us. By Grace Hurrell. Pp. 88. (Sheed & Ward. 6s.)

UNDER the impression that the Communion of Saints is a doctrine insufficiently stressed in the teaching of our children, Grace Hurrell is determined to do her part in rectifying the matter by filling in what we must all acknowledge to be a gap in the Religious curriculum. Her quite lovely stories of holy men and women are produced in fine bold type, and illustrated by Mona Doneux with pictures that certainly deserve that indefinable epithet—charm. Both author and artist have indulged their whimsey in producing a rare delight among children's books.

The Childhood of Jesus. By Magdalen Eldon and Frances Phipps. Pp. 96. (Collins. 6s.)

A BOOK for any child, one of the Junior School having first claim, the outline pictures for colouring—hundreds of them—being of Junior standard. The questions in the "looking-up" game at the end of the

book can be answered by anyone who can read, all the references being given by which the answers can be found in the preceding pages. A very wise piece of authorship, this, in the true catechetical method.

It is a pleasure to commend the main part of the book, the story (largely in Gospel narrative) of Our Lord's life as a child. He is seen so much like other children, the member of a family where life goes on from day to day as it does in any normal home. His big adventures, like the Flight into Egypt, are vividly described; and His virtues, especially His perfect obedience, shine with a light by which any ordinary child may see. Surprisingly human He appears throughout the story, but on every page nevertheless as the Child Divine.

A Christmas Painting Book. 2s. 6d. *The Ten Commandments.* 3s. *First Communion Souvenirs.* 2s. 6d. *Twelve Holy Pictures.* 1s. 6d. By Sister M. Ansgar, O.P. (Bloomsbury Publishing Co. Ltd., 34 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1.)

THE first two titles are of outline books containing numerous drawings for filling in with colour. Christmas gives the child artist great scope, with the figures of the Holy Family, and almost everyone and everything connected with the Crib, waiting for the paintbox. The Divine Child is shown in twenty different drawings, and of angels there is a choir. Odd corners of pages are filled in with stars and robins and even rats.

When Sister M. Ansgar depicts naughty boys who are breaking the Commandments she gives them the old look that teachers know only too well. Colouring up the little wretches should be a good way of impressing upon the minds of children the idea: "I must not be like THIS." Grown-ups will find some amusement in these illustrations, particularly on sheet No. 9; but for children they will mean one thing: clear pictures of words that otherwise would be difficult to understand.

Four brightly coloured pictures in large octavo, wired together but perforated and easily detachable, make a useful addition to the teacher's stock of souvenirs of First Communion. These pictures are much nearer the mental age of First Communicants than are most publications produced for them.

The *Twelve Holy Pictures* are black-and-white cards for children's prayerbooks, and like the souvenirs already mentioned are wired into a block and perforated to be easily detached. They will hold the eyes and mind of any child who sees them.

L. T. H.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

s
.
.
y
n
s
-
s
n
-

t
r
-

-
t
d
e
s
d

g
w
y
e
-
n
lt

r
e
e
st

's
d
e

-